

Also, papers to accompany bill for a pension to Mrs. Susan Lasley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Protest of Long Island Lodge, No. 232, order of B'rith Abraham, Brooklyn, N. Y., against the exclusion of Jewish immigrants at the port of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mrs. Josephine Drinkwater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Paper to accompany bill for a pension to Charles E. Mahew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of community of Hiwassee College, Tenn., for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Sarah Crabtree, of Chattanooga, Tenn., praying reference of war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of T. J. Townsend, pastor of Baptist Church at Decherd, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of J. J. Hosemueller and others, favoring House bill 178—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Deems & Raber, of Laud, Ind., urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWANN: Papers to accompany House bill 16903, granting a pension to Susan J. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Papers to accompany House bill for increase of pension to A. T. Sullenger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for increase of pension of Granville E. Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Calvin W. Birg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5763 granting a pension to Anna Beauchamp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 21, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. ELKINS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Comptroller of the Currency calling attention to the language in section 2, page 9, of the bill to establish the department of commerce and labor in regard to the methods of accounting by the proposed new department, and suggesting a substitute therefor in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 31, 1894; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL BANK IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting the petition of Emilio Aguinaldo y Famy, formerly leader of the Philippine insurrection, praying for the enactment of legislation for the establishment of an agricultural bank in the Philippine Islands; which, with the accompanying petition, was referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the First National Bank, of Hoquiam, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a revision of the banking and currency laws; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 44, American Federation of Labor, of Spokane, Wash., praying for the repeal of the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association, of Seattle, Wash., American Federation of Labor, of Seattle, Wash., and a petition of Central Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of Whatcom, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Columbia, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Gov-

ernment buildings and grounds; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Columbia, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in United States immigrant stations; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the internal-revenue laws so as to reduce the tax on distilled spirits; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of the Carriage and Wagon Workers' Local Union of San Francisco; of Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union No. 120, of Stockton; of the Metal Polishers, Buffers, Brass Molders, and Brass Workers' Local Union of San Francisco; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 304, of San Francisco; of Local Union No. 152, of San Francisco; of Local Union No. 68, of San Francisco; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 469, of Bakersfield; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 981, of Petaluma, and of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 483, of San Francisco, all of the American Federation of Labor, and of Lodge No. 73, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Golden West, all in the State of California, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a telegram which I have just received from sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., in opposition to the placing of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the control of and within the department to be designated the department of commerce and labor. I ask that the telegram may be read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

[Telegram.]

CHICAGO, Ill., January 20, 1903.

Hon. SHELBY M. CULLOM,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following preamble and resolutions were adopted this day by the directors of the Chicago Board of Trade:

Whereas it is proposed to place the Interstate Commerce Commission under the control and within a department to be designated the "department of commerce and labor;" and

Whereas by the act of 1887 to regulate commerce it is specifically provided that the said Commission be nonpartisan; and

Whereas to include the said Commission within the proposed new department would place a purely executive duty upon a commission principally engaged in exercising semijudicial authority; and

Whereas the object of the act to regulate commerce is not so much to promote commerce as it is to regulate and control its chief instrumentality, viz, transportation; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission was originally under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department and was removed from the Department by reason of the recommendations of at least two of its Secretaries:

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Board of Trade of the city of Chicago respectfully and earnestly protest against merging the Interstate Commerce Commission within the proposed department of commerce and labor.

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be telegraphed to President Roosevelt and Senators NELSON, ELKINS, CULLOM, and MASON, and to Representatives HEPBURN and MANN.

R. G. CHANDLER, President.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Morris; of Federal Labor Union No. 7241, of Dundee; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 41, of Aurora; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 394, of Sycamore, and of Local Union No. 85, of Kensington, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented the petition of Marshall Field and sundry other citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the establishment of a naval office in connection with the customs-house at the port of Chicago; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Lodge No. 375, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chicago; of Lodge No. 4, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chicago; of Local Union No. 703, of Ridge Prairie; of Cigarmakers' Local Union No. 80, of Danville; of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 178, of Peoria; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 1338, of Utica; of Cigarmakers' Local Union No. 41, of Aurora; of the Tri-City Labor Congress of Rock Island, and of Local Union No. 41, of Catlin, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and a petition of Miners' Union No. 68, of Galena, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a memorial of the Lumbermen's Club of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the legislative board of the Friends' Church of America, praying for the adoption of an

amendment to the bill to promote the efficiency of the militia, so as to provide an exemption clause, based on conscientious scruples; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 8785, American Federation of Labor, of Bluffton, Ind., praying for the repeal of the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Old Soldiers' Republican Club, of Evansville, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation granting a service pension to all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 19, of Elwood; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 1110, of East Chicago; of Typographical Union No. 128, of South Bend, and of Local Union No. 355, of West Terre Haute, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Indiana, and of the Central Labor Union, American Federation of Labor, of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Trades and Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of New Albany, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquors; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the board of directors of the Associated Charities of Boston, Mass., praying that the duty on coal may be permanently removed; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MCCOMAS presented a petition of King Solomon Lodge, No. 97, Order B'rith Abraham, of Baltimore, Md., and a petition of Monumental Lodge, No. 78, Order B'rith Abraham, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to modify the methods and practice pursued by the immigration officers at the port of New York; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BURROWS presented petitions of the Central Labor Union of Saginaw; of Local Union No. 514, of Ann Arbor; of Local Union No. 770, of Muskegon; of the Pattern Makers' Association of Grand Rapids; of Local Union No. 1226, of Manistee; of the Pattern Makers' Association of Detroit; of Typographical Union No. 168, of Muskegon; of Local Union No. 105, of Saginaw; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 651, of Jackson, and of Local Union No. 229, of Detroit, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the Michigan Manufacturers' Association, of Ostego; of W. E. Hill & Co., of Kalamazoo; of Salliotte & Furgason, of River Rouge; of the Lilies Cigar Company, of Kalamazoo; of the American Blower Company, of Detroit, and of E. Tanis & Son, of Kalamazoo, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HEITFELD presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Moscow, Idaho, remonstrating against the repeal of the present timber and stone law; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MILLARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bingham, Alliance, Keano, Mullen, Hecla, Pullman, Chadron, Whitman, Lena, Lakeside, Orlando, Hyannis, Bridgeport, Hemingford, Antioch, Rushville, Luella, Dalton, Keystone, Lilac, Tryon, Thedford, Seneca, and Irwin, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the leasing of the vacant public domain suitable for grazing in the State of Nebraska; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. QUARLES. I present a telegram in the nature of a memorial signed by E. P. Bacon, chairman of the executive committee of the Interstate Commerce Law Convention at Milwaukee, Wis., representing over 100 commercial organizations in a movement to secure legislation strengthening the Interstate Commerce Commission, and remonstrating against converting that Commission into a bureau of any department. As the telegram is very brief, I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

MILWAUKEE, WIS., January 19, 1903.

Hon. J. V. QUARLES,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I am instructed by the executive committee of Interstate Commerce Law Convention, representing over 100 commercial organizations in movement to secure legislation strengthening Interstate Commerce Commission, to petition Congress against converting that Commission into bureau of any department. Please present to Senate.

E. P. BACON, Chairman.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Moscow, Idaho, and a memorial of 300 citizens of Wallace, Idaho, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a memorial of the Trades and Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of New Albany, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the State Agricultural Convention, Columbus, Ohio, praying that a liberal appropriation be made for the erection of a suitable building for the Department of Agriculture; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the State board of agriculture, Columbus, Ohio, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the tariff law relative to the importation of pure-bred animals; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of the Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Durham, Me., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called militia bill, and praying for the adoption of an amendment to that bill so as to provide an exemption clause based on conscientious scruples; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Alaska Territorial Club, of Ketchikan, Alaska, praying for the enactment of legislation providing self-government for that Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BACON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$12,000 to pay to Ellen B. Buck one year's salary of her late husband, Alfred B. Buck, late minister plenipotentiary to Japan, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying memorandum showing precedents for the proposed legislation, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CULLOM, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. NELSON on the 20th instant, proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at Amsterdam, Netherlands, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. FRYE on the 13th instant, proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at Sydney, Nova Scotia, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. FRYE December 16, 1902, proposing to increase the salary of the United States minister to Norway and Sweden, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 20th instant, proposing to appropriate \$1,500 for secretary of legation to Switzerland, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. ALLISON, proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at Monterey, Mexico, and to increase the allowance for clerk hire at that consulate, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$12,000 to pay the salaries of 8 consular clerks, at \$1,500 each, and also \$6,000 to pay the salaries of 5 consular clerks, at \$1,200 each, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$15,000 to enable the Secretary of State to supply working libraries at such embassies and legations of the United States abroad as he may deem necessary, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, reported an amendment proposing to increase the allowance for clerk hire at the consulate at Hongkong from \$1,600 to \$2,200, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, reported an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the consul-general at Munich from \$2,000 to \$2,500, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, reported an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the consul at Odessa, Russia, from \$2,500 to \$3,000, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$7,500 to pay the salary of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Siam, and also proposing to appropriate \$4,000 to pay the salary of the consul-general at Bangkok, Siam, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. GAMBLE on December 17, 1902, proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at Beirut, Syria, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself December 11, 1902, proposing to appropriate \$3,000 for preparing and reprinting a new edition of the Consular Regulations, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, reported an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at Lourenço Marquez, Africa, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 15396) granting an increase of pension to George H. Stone; and

A bill (H. R. 16011) granting an increase of pension to Morton A. Leach.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 7766) granting an increase of pension to John Huffman; and

A bill (H. R. 15648) granting an increase of pension to Lester H. Salisbury.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12324) granting a pension to Cora E. Brown, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FORAKER, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 7054) to provide a government for the island of Tutuila and the islands adjacent thereto within the jurisdiction of the United States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 10757) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Fishbaugh; and

A bill (H. R. 12463) granting an increase of pension to Hiram A. Hober.

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13944) granting a pension to Margaret Ann West, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

DIGEST OF COURT OF CLAIMS DECISIONS.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 126) to provide for the printing of a digest of the decisions of the Court of Claims, together with the rules of practice of and the statutes relating to that court, to report it favorably with amendments, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendments of the Committee on Printing were, in line 13 on page 1, before the word "copies," to fill the blank with "one thousand;" and in line 3 on page 2 to fill the blank before "dollars" with "two thousand five hundred;" so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc. That there be printed a digest of the decisions of the Court of Claims, including the statutes relating to, and the rules of practice of, that court, prepared by Chapman W. Maupin; that there be printed 500 copies for the use of the Treasury Department, 2,000 copies for the use of the Attorney-General, 250 copies for the use of the War Department, 250 copies for the use of the Navy Department, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for public sale, the whole edition to be bound in sheep; said digest to be printed under the editorial supervision of Chapman W. Maupin, the preparation and editing of said digest by him to be paid for, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, at a price not to exceed the sum of \$2,500, which sum is hereby appropriated in full payment for said work, except the cost of printing and binding the same, and shall not be payable until said work shall have been printed; nor shall any money be paid out on account of said work until the Court of Claims, or some member thereof, shall certify that the work, as completed, is satisfactory to that court.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 7053) to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 7055) granting a pension to Vina Lindenbower; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Mrs. Vina Lindenbower praying for a pension for nursing and caring for Union soldiers, together with the affidavits of Dr. S. H. Melchoir and S. D. Galbraith. I move that the bill and the accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 7056) to provide for the disposition of church lands in Porto Rico, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. MCCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 7057) granting an increase of pension to John Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7058) granting a pension to Abbie M. Jones; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7059) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Casler; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 7060) granting an increase of pension to Ann M. Jackman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 7061) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon J. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 7062) amending the statutes relating to patents, relieving medical and dental practitioners from unjust burdens imposed by patentees holding patents covering methods and devices for treating human diseases, ailments, and disabilities; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 7063) permitting the building of a dam across the St. Croix River at or near the village of St. Croix Falls, Polk County, Wis.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7064) granting a pension to Amanda L. Mardin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 7065) for the relief of the heirs of the late Joseph E. Montgomery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 7066) correcting the military record of Boniface Meyer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7067) granting an increase of pension to James H. Mount; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7068) granting an increase of pension to John Sexton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 7069) for the

appointment of an additional judge in the Indian Territory; which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLINGTON in the chair). The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The bill relates to matters in the Indian Territory. I am not quite sure whether bills of this sort have gone to the Committee on the Judiciary or to the Committee on Indian Affairs. It is a matter relating to internal affairs down there. However, I believe it is immaterial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Arkansas thinks the bill should be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and if he is informed as to that reference, the Chair will order it to be referred to that committee.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let the bill go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I think under the rule bills of this character go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Most bills relating to the appointment of judges do go to that committee, I know, but in matters relating to the Indian Territory I am not quite sure whether bills for the appointment of practically local judges there have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary or not. I have no objection to the bill going to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I would suggest that the bill go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be so referred.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 7070) granting an increase of pension to William G. Cantley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7071) granting an increase of pension to Francis N. Bonneau; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 156) dedicating to the city of Columbus, in the State of Ohio, for uses and purposes of the public streets, part of property conveyed to the United States by Robert Neil by deed dated February 17, 1863, recorded in deed book 76, page 572, and so forth, Franklin County records; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CLARK of Montana submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,000 for improving Kansas avenue from Trenton to Utica streets, in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment authorizing the sale of tracts of land, not to exceed 160 acres to each individual, in the Red Lake Indian Reservation, Red Lake County, Minn., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$75,000 to aid in the reconstruction of the building for the Homeopathic Hospital, in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. HARRIS, it was

Ordered, That J. W. Reser have leave to withdraw his petition and papers from the files of the Senate, in connection with Senate bill No. 2580, first session Fifty-fifth Congress, there having been no adverse report thereon;

Ordered, That Elijah A. Gilbert have leave to withdraw his petition and papers from the files of the Senate, in connection with Senate bill No. 829, first session Fifty-sixth Congress, there having been no adverse report thereon;

Ordered, That Charles A. Bess have leave to withdraw his petition and papers from the files of the Senate, in connection with Senate bill No. 2759, first session Fifty-sixth Congress, there having been no adverse report thereon.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR PORTO RICO.

Mr. FORAKER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, as it originally appeared in the report of the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, but with the addition of 50 full-page illustrations, 7,000 copies of the report of the commissioner of education for Porto Rico, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,500 for the use of the Commissioner of Education of the United States, and 1,500 for the use of the commissioner of education for Porto Rico.

IMPROVEMENT OF COLUMBIA RIVER, WASHINGTON.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination to

be made of the Columbia River, in the State of Washington, between Wenatchee and Kettle Falls, with a view to removing obstructions to navigation, and to submit plans and estimates of cost therefor.

PUGET SOUND AND LAKES WASHINGTON AND UNION CANAL.

Mr. TURNER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to transmit to the Senate the report of the board of engineers appointed to determine the feasibility of constructing a canal, with necessary locks and dams, connecting Puget Sound with Lakes Washington and Union, as provided by the act of Congress entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1902.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 16842) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ANTHRACITE COAL.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator rise to morning business?

Mr. QUAY. I rise to inquire whether the morning business is closed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not yet closed. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. VEST on the 5th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be instructed to prepare and report a bill amending "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897, so that the tariff duty shall be removed from anthracite coal and the same be placed on the free list.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the desire of the Senate as to this resolution?

Mr. QUAY. As I understand it, the Chair rules that the resolution of the Senator from Missouri comes in under the order of morning business and is a part of the order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a part of the order, and the Chair desires to know what the Senate wishes to do with the resolution. It has been laid over from morning to morning, retaining its place.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope it will go over another day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the resolution may retain its place on the table. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPOONER. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri if he has any objection to a reference of the resolution to the committee?

Mr. VEST. I have not.

Mr. SPOONER. I have a conviction, Mr. President, that it is not in the power of the constitution of the Senate to originate a bill which increases a tariff rate, or reduces a tariff rate, or removes a tariff rate; and for the purpose of securing from the committee a report upon that subject—and it would be as well for that purpose to secure a report upon this resolution as any other measure—with the consent of the Senator from Missouri, I move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has just been laid on the table by unanimous consent.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent, then, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR. Why should it go to the Committee on Finance and not to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? If it is a mere question of the privilege of the Senate, the Finance Committee has no jurisdiction over it.

Mr. SPOONER. It relates to the tariff.

Mr. HOAR. I am aware of that; but if it is referred for the purpose of ascertaining what are the privileges of the Senate, as I understand the Senator to state that it is to be referred for that purpose, it should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Finance Committee have at various times made reports upon this subject. There is no objection, certainly, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections also making a report if they should see fit to make it.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator from Massachusetts desires to perform that labor, I should be very glad to have him do it.

Mr. HOAR. I do not make the suggestion because of a desire to perform any labor. I desire to retain the proper jurisdiction in the different committees of the Senate; that is all. I think the question of the constitutional right of the Senate to originate

certain measures is a question which belongs to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, if there be any question belonging to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. This is a resolution proposing to instruct the Committee on Finance in regard to a certain matter in relation to tariff duties. Certainly, if the resolution has any reference at all, it should go to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will Senators allow the Chair, if possible, to get the resolution back before the Senate? Is there unanimous consent that the unanimous consent given by which the resolution was tabled be reconsidered?

Mr. HOAR. What was the unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request for unanimous consent was that the resolution should lie on the table, retaining its place. That was agreed to. Now, is there unanimous consent—

Mr. HOAR. Has not the agreement by unanimous consent exhausted itself by the resolution going over until this morning?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was done this morning—five minutes ago. Is there unanimous consent that that action shall be considered? The Chair hears no objection, and the resolution is now before the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope a motion will now be made to refer it to some committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Rhode Island to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance. That is the pending motion.

Mr. SPOONER. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 16842) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

STATEHOOD BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

Mr. QUAY. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the omnibus statehood bill. I have not the number at hand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12543) to enable the people of Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to form constitutions and State governments and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, there will be no objection upon our side to proceeding immediately with the consideration of the statehood bill. We are quite ready to proceed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. President—

Mr. PETTUS. I wish to ask the indulgence of the Senate to consider a bill relating to Alabama courts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama desires to ask consideration for a bill on the Calendar touching courts in Alabama. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BURNHAM. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 14839) providing that the circuit court of appeals of the fifth judicial circuit of the United States shall hold at least one term of said court annually in the city of Montgomery, in the State of Alabama, on the first Monday in September of each year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read to the Senate for its information.

The Secretary read the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I object for the present, and I will object, as at present advised, for some time to any request for unanimous consent for the intrusion of any other business into the belly of the discussion of the statehood bill.

I will say to my friend from Alabama, however, who seems interested in the speedy passage of this measure, that later in the day, if possible, I will withdraw the objection.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will be willing at the same time to allow a vote to be taken upon the bankruptcy bill, if that can be done without debate. The bill has been read, and I think there will be no objection to its passage.

Mr. QUAY. If the time occurs when I can withdraw the objection to the bill of the Senator from Alabama, I will certainly not object to acceding to the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania objects, and the bill called up by the Senator from Alabama will be returned to the Calendar.

Mr. BURNHAM addressed the Senate. After having spoken for nearly three hours, he said:

Mr. President, I believe those who have preceded me have not occupied much more time than I have done, and I should like to suspend for the present, resuming to-morrow.

Mr. QUAY and Mr. CULLOM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire yields the floor.

[Mr. BURNHAM'S speech will be published entire after it shall have been concluded.]

Mr. QUAY. I understand the Senator from New Hampshire to state that he does not desire to proceed further this evening, but will go on to-morrow. I gave notice yesterday, first, that I would move to proceed to the consideration of the statehood bill at the conclusion of the morning business to-day; and second, that I would ask the Senate to remain in session continuously until it was disposed of.

I do not desire to impose upon my distinguished friend from New Hampshire. If he desires to postpone the delivery of the remainder of his remarks until to-morrow, that course is entirely satisfactory, I have no doubt, to many upon this floor who have been listening with the greatest interest to what he has said. But if he is not going to speak, then I will have to ask an opponent of the statehood bill, or some person in favor of the statehood bill who desires to be heard, to take his place on the floor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senator will not adhere to that position. It is a novel one, certainly an extraordinary measure, an uncommon device. The other day when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] was delivering his very able argument and at a certain hour desired to quit for the day and conclude on the next day, no objection whatever was raised to that course.

Mr. QUAY. No; the Senator does not understand me. I have no objection to the Senator from New Hampshire yielding the floor for the day.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am coming to that. Nor was there a suggestion that anybody should interject into the midst of the remarks of the Senator from Ohio a speech of his own. That in itself would have been a discourtesy to the Senator from Ohio.

I think it must be clear to the judgment of every Senator here that when a Senator is making a closely knit and continuous argument, very carefully prepared, as the Senator from New Hampshire is making, it will not add anything to the understanding of the question being discussed, for some other Senator, for the mere purpose of talking, to interject a speech in the midst of it.

What we are trying to do, Mr. President, is to debate the question before Senators whose minds are open, in order that each one of us may have the most light possible. What we are attempting to do is not merely to waste time. Yet the Senator must see that if what he suggests were done it would be nothing but the wasting of time. It could not afford any good results to any person who desires to be informed upon this question to interject into the midst of the careful argument of a Senator, very thoroughly prepared, some discursive remarks by some one else, merely for the purpose of taking up time.

I therefore trust that the Senator will not insist upon his somewhat anomalous request.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President—

Mr. QUAY. I will insist upon my request.

Mr. CULLOM. As I have stated once or twice before, I am very anxious that the subject of the treaty with Cuba, which is now in the Senate, should be taken up and acted upon as speedily as is consistent with its proper consideration. We have now but a couple of weeks or less remaining before the end of this month, and at that time, by the terms of the treaty, it expires. I should like very much, if the Senator from Pennsylvania would allow me, to move an executive session.

Mr. QUAY. I can not prevent that.

Mr. CULLOM. I know you can not prevent my making the motion, for I have a right to make it; but I should be glad if the Senator would consent to it without any contest. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM] has concluded for the day a long speech, and, being weary, he does not desire to speak further this evening. I do not know whether the speech yet to be delivered is very long, but I think, in ordinary courtesy to the Senator from New Hampshire, he should be allowed to discontinue his remarks for the day and commence them again to-morrow without any interruption; but whether he does or not,

I think the Senator from Pennsylvania having charge of the statehood bill will get along just as well without contesting the question of having an executive session this afternoon as by contesting it.

So far as I am concerned, I have been trying to get along without any controversy between myself and that Senator, as he knows, and I thought, when I told him a while ago that I desired to make this motion, that he certainly would consent to it if the Senator from New Hampshire felt that he ought not to be expected to proceed further to-day. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will now allow me to make the motion without any controversy.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I regret to say that I am not able to assent to the proposition of the Senator from Illinois, and that I must adhere to the notice I gave yesterday. As the Senator knows, I am in favor of the treaty, and I have no doubt it will be ratified, but he will obtain but an hour for its consideration by going on this afternoon, and in order to accommodate him this afternoon we shall have to break off the arrangement of the friends of the statehood bill that the Senate be kept in session. So I feel it to be my duty to antagonize the motion, and I ask that it be voted down.

Mr. CULLOM. I think I will make the motion so as to see whether the Senate, under the circumstances, desire to stay here and do nothing, rather than to go into executive session and consider the treaty. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. The question is on that motion. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I suggest that there is not a quorum of the Senate present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The roll will be called.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich.	Clark, Wyo.	Heitfeld,	Pettus,
Alger,	Clay,	Hoar,	Platt, N. Y.
Allison,	Culberson,	Jones, Ark.	Quay,
Bacon,	Cullom,	Jones, Nev.	Rawlins,
Bate,	Dietrich,	Lodge,	Simmons,
Berry,	Dubois,	McComas,	Simon,
Beveridge,	Foraker,	McCumber,	Spooner,
Blackburn,	Foster, La.	McLaurin, Miss.	Stewart,
Burnham,	Frye,	Mallory,	Taliaferro,
Burrows,	Gamble,	Mason,	Turner,
Burton,	Gibson,	Millard,	Vest,
Carmack,	Hanna,	Morgan,	Wellington.
Clapp,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	
Clark, Mont.	Harris,	Perkins,	

Mr. McLaurin of Mississippi. My colleague [Mr. MONEY] is unavoidably absent because of sickness.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. PRITCHARD] is unavoidably detained from the Senate by illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-four Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum present.

The Chair announced that the motion for an executive session was carried, but he will, of course, regard that as an open question, under the circumstances, and will again put the question on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. QUAY. I demand the yeas and nays upon the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What is the question, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS]. He not being in the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand that by arrangement the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] who has just voted in the affirmative is paired with my colleague [Mr. BAILEY], who is absent.

Mr. CULLOM. I am reminded by the announcement of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] that I am paired with his colleague [Mr. BAILEY]. I agreed with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] this morning to stand paired with the Senator from Texas for to-day. I will transfer that pair, by the leave of the Senate, to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], and will therefore let my vote in the affirmative stand.

Mr. QUAY. If the Chair will allow me to make an inquiry, I should be glad to know who is the standing pair on the other side of the Chamber with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has no pair.

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], but I understand that

the pair has been transferred to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin if that is correct?

Mr. SPOONER. That transfer was requested of me this morning upon the statement that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] had no pair.

Mr. QUAY. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] are on the same side on this question.

Mr. DUBOIS. I understand the Senator from Oregon and his regular pair are agreed on this question. Then, if it be satisfactory to the Senator from Wisconsin, I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], but I will take the liberty of transferring that pair to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and vote "nay." I think that arrangement will also release the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. He is detained, I understand, by illness. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MCENERY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. DEFEW]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi (when Mr. MONEY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MONEY] is detained from the Senate by illness, as I have stated. He is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] upon this question is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT], as I am informed.

Mr. PLATT of New York (when his name was called). I am paired on this question with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. SIMMONS (when Mr. PRITCHARD's name was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. PRITCHARD] is unavoidably absent from the Senate on account of sickness. My colleague has a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN].

Mr. QUAY (when Mr. SCOTT's name was called). I understand that the Senators from West Virginia are paired with each other on this question. I have been so informed.

Mr. SPOONER. I agreed with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] to pair for the day upon all questions relating to the statehood bill with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN], who is absent without a pair.

Mr. QUAY. Is the Senator sure of that?

Mr. SPOONER. I am not, but I am so informed.

Mr. QUAY. I am inclined to think he would vote "yea," if present.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know how he would vote. Then, Mr. President, I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TALIAFERRO (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], but I understand it has been arranged to transfer that pair to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Did I understand the Senator to say an arrangement had been made?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. That was my understanding.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I had not so understood it. Of course, if anybody knows about it, it is all right.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The assistant sergeant-at-arms gave me the information.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], who happens to be absent to-day, has charge of these matters, and I have not heard before of the arrangement suggested by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO], but if the assistant sergeant-at-arms says so, of course I have no objection, because the junior Senator from West Virginia and the senior Senator from West Virginia are on opposite sides on this question.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I do not know that it is material that the Senator has not heard of it, Mr. President.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not at all.

Mr. QUAY (when Mr. TELLER's name was called). The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is paired on this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TURNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], but

I understand he has been paired with another Senator on this question. I therefore feel free to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when Mr. WARREN's name was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. WARREN] is unavoidably absent. He is paired on this question with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. I make this announcement as to all votes which may be had during the remainder of the day.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], who is absent, but I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], and vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the pairs may be stated. There seems to have been a good deal of confusion in regard to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pairs will be stated before the vote is announced.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I inquire how the junior Senator from California [Mr. BARD] is recorded as voting?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he is recorded in the affirmative.

Mr. LODGE. Can the pairs not now be stated, Mr. President? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Reporter will read a statement of the pairs.

The Reporter read the pairs which had been announced during the progress of the vote.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not possible to have the list of all the pairs stated? No doubt the Reporter has correctly read the pairs as announced, but I want to hear read the list of all the pairs as they stand. I have known it frequently done on occasions where there was confusion in regard to the pairs. What I want is an actual statement of all the pairs as they now stand.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, there is some confusion in regard to the pairs of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and myself, and I think the record does not show the precise situation. If I may be pardoned, I will state that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] and myself have a general pair. My pair with the Senator from Oregon was transferred to the Senator from Wisconsin. Afterwards the Senator from Wisconsin transferred that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN]; so that eventually the Senator from Oregon stood paired with the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from Wisconsin and myself were both released from our pairs and voted.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I desire to inquire what was the statement of the record with reference to the pair of my colleague [Mr. BAILEY]? That was omitted just now in the statement which was read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] is paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. CULBERSON. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] stands paired with another Senator, as announced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] a moment ago, who transferred his pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] is paired with both the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], according to the announcement.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. DRYDEN. Mr. President, I have just entered the Chamber with the expectation of voting; but I understand that the roll has been called and that I have been paired. I desire to know with whom I have been paired.

Mr. QUAY. I did not catch the remark of the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey states that he came into the Chamber with the expectation of voting, and finds that he is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], which was the pair transferred by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. SPOONER. I withdraw my vote, Mr. President. That leaves the Senator from New Jersey the right to vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin withdraws his vote.

Mr. DRYDEN. Then, Mr. President, I vote "yea."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. With whom has it been announced, if at all, that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KEARNS] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTEDGE] are paired? Have they been announced as being paired? Both would vote "yea" upon this proposition if here.

Mr. QUAY. Now, Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. Mr. SPOONER. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KEARNS], and vote "yea."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He would vote "yea," if present.

Mr. SPOONER. Therefore I have a right to vote; and I vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE. Now let the pairs be read from the desk.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi (after voting in the negative). I desire to inquire if the Senator from Washington [Mr. FOSTER] is recorded as voting?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. I desire to inquire whether he has been announced as paired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that no pair has been announced for the Senator from Washington [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. Then I withdraw my vote. [A pause.] I am now informed that the Senator from Washington, if he were present, would vote the same way I do; and so I will let my vote stand.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, can not the pairs now be read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order has been called, which is the announcement of the vote.

Mr. LODGE. I thought it was part of the regular order to announce the pairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the list of pairs.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. WARREN with Mr. DANIEL.
Mr. HALE with Mr. FOSTER of Washington.
Mr. PLATT of New York with Mr. PENROSE.
Mr. KEARNS with Mr. MITCHELL.
Mr. SCOTT with Mr. ELKINS.
Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. TELLER.
Mr. DILLINGHAM with Mr. TILLMAN.
Mr. KEAN with Mr. MONEY.
Mr. KITTEDGE with Mr. PATTERSON.
Mr. DEPEW with Mr. MCENERY.
Mr. PLATT of Connecticut with Mr. BAILEY.
Mr. PRITCHARD with Mr. McLAURIN of South Carolina.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I understand the Senator from Washington [Mr. FOSTER] is absent without a pair, so I transfer my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to the Senator from Washington [Mr. FOSTER], and vote. I vote "nay," and I understand the Senator from Washington if present would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 37; as follows:

YEAS—27.

Aldrich,	Clapp,	Frye,	Nelson,
Alger,	Cullom,	Gamble,	Proctor,
Allison,	Deboe,	Hanna,	Quarles,
Bard,	Dietrich,	Hoar,	Simon,
Beveridge,	Dolliver,	Lodge,	Spooner,
Burnham,	Dryden,	McComas,	Wetmore.
Burrows,	Fairbanks,	Millard,	

NAYS—37.

Bacon,	Culberson,	Jones, Nev.	Rawlins,
Bate,	Dubois,	McCumber,	Simmons,
Berry,	Foraker,	McLaurin, Miss.	Stewart,
Blackburn,	Foster, La.	Mallory,	Taliaferro,
Burton,	Gallinger,	Martin,	Turner,
Carmack,	Gibson,	Mason,	Vest,
Clark, Mont.	Hansbrough,	Morgan,	Wellington.
Clark, Wyo.	Harris,	Perkins,	
Clay,	Heitfeld,	Pettus,	
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Quay,	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bailey,	Hale,	McLaurin, S. C.	Platt, N. Y.
Daniel,	Hawley,	Mitchell,	Pritchard,
Depew,	Kean,	Money,	Scott,
Dillingham,	Kearns,	Patterson,	Teller,
Elkins,	Kittedge,	Penrose,	Tillman,
Foster, Wash.	McEnery,	Platt, Conn.	Warren.

So the Senate refused to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. QUAY. Now, Mr. President, before proceeding further, during the morning hour, about the time when this bill was taken up, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] asked unanimous consent for the consideration of three measures on which they pledged themselves there would be no discussion. I objected, but said at the same time that I thought during the day an occasion would arise when that legislation might be disposed of. That time has now arrived, and I am ready to give way to those three Senators for the purpose of calling up their bills, with the understanding that they shall not be discussed. I withdraw my objection, leaving it open to them to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BERRY. Without displacing the regular order.

Mr. QUAY. Without displacing the regular order.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that we may proceed

with the consideration of the bill to amend the bankruptcy act. I will state that I have consulted with the gentlemen who so far as I can ascertain are opposed to the bill, and none desire to debate it. It merely corrects an injustice. The bill has been already read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 13679) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. QUAY. I withdraw the objection made in the morning hour, with the understanding that the bill will elicit no discussion. If it provokes discussion, I shall renew the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

Mr. HOAR. It has been read.

Mr. QUAY. It has been read.

Mr. HOAR. It was read yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PETTUS. There are objections to the bill which ought to be considered in the Senate, and for the time being I shall have to object to it, as I want to offer an amendment. I would not object on any occasion when there is time to consider it at all.

Mr. HOAR. May I be allowed to say that I made the statement I did to the Senate on the understanding that nobody desired to discuss the bill? But if the Senator from Alabama, who I understand does not desire to discuss it, wishes to offer an amendment, certainly I do not want to press it now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama objects.

Mr. HOAR subsequently said: I understand the Senator from Alabama makes no further objection to the present consideration of the bill to amend the bankruptcy act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Alabama withdraws his objection to the consideration of the bill called up by the Senator from Massachusetts. The Chair will now ask if there is objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was to strike out section 1 as follows:

That clause 15 of section 1 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"(15) A person shall be deemed insolvent within the provisions of this act whenever the aggregate of his property, exclusive of any property which he may have conveyed, transferred, concealed, or removed, or permitted to be concealed or removed, with intent to defraud, hinder, or delay his creditors, or which is exempt from being taken on execution under the laws of the United States or of the State or Territory in which the proceedings in bankruptcy were begun shall not, at a fair valuation, be sufficient in amount to pay his debts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 6, to strike out "Sec. 2."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 11, after the word "services" to insert "but not at a greater rate than in this act allowed trustees for similar services;" so as to make the clause read:

(5) Authorize the business of bankrupts to be conducted for limited periods by receivers, the marshals, or trustees, if necessary in the best interests of the estates, and allow such officers additional compensation for such services, but not at a greater rate than in this act allowed trustees for similar services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 14, to change the number of the section from 3 to 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 18, after the word "for" to strike out "or been put in charge of a receiver or trustee" and insert "a receiver or trustee for his property or because of insolvency a receiver or trustee has been put in charge of his property," and in line 22, before the word "Territory" to strike out "or" and insert "of a;" so as to make the clause read:

Or (4) made a general assignment for the benefit of his creditors, or, being insolvent, applied for a receiver or trustee for his property or because of insolvency a receiver or trustee has been put in charge of his property under the laws of a State, of a Territory, or of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 23, to change the number of the section from "4" to "3," and in the same line, before the word "section," to insert "subdivision b of;" so as to read:

Sec. 3. That subdivision b of section 4 of said act be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to strike out:

SEC. 4. Who may become bankrupts. A. Any natural person and any unincorporated company owing debts shall be entitled to the benefits of this act as a voluntary bankrupt.

b. Any corporation engaged principally in manufacturing, trading, printing, publishing, mining, or mercantile pursuits shall be entitled to the benefits of this act as a voluntary bankrupt, on petition of an officer or stockholder of such corporation, duly authorized at a meeting of stockholders held for that purpose by the vote of a majority in amount of the total stock of the corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 12, to change the lettering of the subdivision in section 3 from "c" to "b."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, to strike out the quotation marks at the end of the paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 23, to strike out the letter "d" at the beginning of the subdivision.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 1, to change the number of the section from "5" to "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 13, after the word "credit," to strike out:

Upon a materially false statement in writing made by him to any person for the purpose of obtaining credit, or of being communicated to the trade or to the person from whom he obtained such property on credit.

And insert:

From any person upon a materially false statement in writing made to such person for the purpose of obtaining such property on credit.

In line 19, after the word "or," to strike out:

(4) Made a fraudulent transfer of any portion of his property to any person.

And insert:

(4) At any time subsequent to the first day of the four months immediately preceding the filing of the petition transferred, removed, destroyed, or concealed, or permitted to be removed, destroyed, or concealed any of his property with intent to hinder, delay, or defraud his creditors.

On page 5, line 1, before the word "been," to strike out "or denied" and insert "in voluntary proceedings;" in line 3, before the word "proceedings," to strike out "his" and insert "the;" and in the same line, before the word "refused" to insert "in bankruptcy;" so as to make the subdivision read:

"b. The judge shall hear the application for a discharge, and such proofs and pleas as may be made in opposition thereto by parties in interest, at such time as will give parties in interest a reasonable opportunity to be fully heard, and investigate the merits of the application and discharge the applicant unless he has (1) committed an offense punishable by imprisonment as herein provided; or (2) with intent to conceal his financial condition, destroyed, concealed, or failed to keep books of account or records from which such condition might be ascertained; or (3) obtained property on credit from any person upon a materially false statement in writing made to such person for the purpose of obtaining such property on credit; or (4) at any time subsequent to the first day of the four months immediately preceding the filing of the petition transferred, removed, destroyed, or concealed, or permitted to be removed, destroyed, or concealed, any of his property with intent to hinder, delay, or defraud his creditors; or (5) in voluntary proceedings been granted a discharge in bankruptcy within six years; or (6) in the course of the proceedings in bankruptcy refused to obey any lawful order of or to answer any material question approved by the court."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 6, to change the number of the section from 6 to 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 13, before the word "obtaining," to strike out "frauds, or;" so as to read:

SEC. 17. Debts not affected by a discharge.—A discharge in bankruptcy shall release a bankrupt from all of his provable debts, except such as (1) are due as a tax levied by the United States, the State, county, district, or municipality in which he resides; (2) are liabilities for obtaining property by false pretenses or false representations, or for willful and malicious injuries to the person or property of another, or for alimony due or to become due, or for maintenance or support of wife or child, or for seduction of an unmarried female, or for criminal conversation;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 24, to change the number of the section from 7 to 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 9, before the word "days," to strike out "ten" and insert "fifteen," and in line 16, after the word "be," to strike out "not more than twenty days after the first publication" and insert "ten days after the last publication unless the judge shall for cause fix a longer time;" so as to read:

a. Upon the filing of a petition for involuntary bankruptcy, service thereof, with a writ of subpoena, shall be made upon the person therein named as defendant in the same manner that service of such process is now had upon the commencement of a suit in equity in the courts of the United States, except that it shall be returnable within fifteen days, unless the judge shall for cause fix a longer time; but in case personal service can not be made, then notice shall be given by publication in the same manner and for the same time as provided by law for notice by publication in suits to enforce a legal or equitable lien in courts of the United States, except that, unless the judge shall otherwise direct, the order shall be published not more than once a

week for two consecutive weeks, and the return day shall be ten days after the last publication unless the judge shall for cause fix a longer time.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 21, after the word "petition," to strike out "on or before" and insert "within five days after;" so as to make the clause read:

b The bankrupt, or any creditor, may appear and plead to the petition within five days after the return day, or within such further time as the court may allow.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 23, to change the number of the section from 8 to 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 7, to strike out the following:

That the wife shall not be so examined except as to business transactions to which she is or has been a party, and she may be examined to determine that fact.

And insert:

That the wife may be examined only touching business transacted by her or to which she is a party, and to determine the fact whether she has transacted or been a party to any business of the bankrupt.

So as to make the proviso of section 7 read:

Provided, That the wife may be examined only touching business transacted by her or to which she is a party, and to determine the fact whether she has transacted or been a party to any business of the bankrupt.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 14, to change the number of the section from 9 to 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 23, before the word "section," to insert "and;" and in the same line, after the words "subdivision e," to strike out "and section 70, subdivision e;" so as to make section 8 read:

SEC. 8. That subdivision b of section 23 of said act be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"b Suits by the trustee shall only be brought or prosecuted in the courts where the bankrupt whose estate is being administered by such trustee might have brought or prosecuted them if proceedings in bankruptcy had not been instituted, unless by consent of the proposed defendant, except suits for the recovery of property under section 60, subdivision b, and section 67, subdivision e."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 1, to change the number of the section from 10 to 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 5, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen;" in line 7, before the word "cents," to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-five," and in line 11, after the word "moneys," to strike out "received and paid out" and insert "disbursed to creditors;" so as to make section 9 read:

SEC. 9. That subdivision a of section 40 of said act be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"a Referees shall receive as full compensation for their services, payable after they are rendered, a fee of \$15 deposited with the clerk at the time the petition is filed in each case, except when a fee is not required from a voluntary bankrupt, and 25 cents for every proof of claim filed for allowance, to be paid from the estate, if any, as a part of the cost of administration, and from estates which have been administered before them 1 per cent commissions on all moneys disbursed to creditors by the trustee, or one-half of 1 per cent on the amount to be paid to creditors upon the confirmation of a composition."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 14, to insert:

SEC. 10. That section 47 is hereby amended by adding thereto the following subdivision:

"c The trustee shall, within thirty days after the adjudication, file a certified copy of the decree of adjudication in the office where conveyances of real estate are recorded in every county where the bankrupt owns real estate not exempt from execution, and pay the fee for such filing, and he shall receive a compensation of 50 cents for each copy so filed, which, together with the filing fee, shall be paid out of the estate of the bankrupt as a part of the cost and disbursements of the proceedings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 5, before the word "dollars," to strike out "ten" and insert "five;" in line 8, after the word "moneys," to strike out "received and paid out" and insert "disbursed;" in line 10, after the word "exceed," to strike out "ten" and insert "six," and in line 11, after the word "less," to strike out:

Five per cent on the next \$1,000 or part thereof, 3 per cent on the next \$5,000 or part thereof, and 1 per cent on such moneys in excess of \$10,000. In the event of the confirmation of a composition after the qualification of a trustee, the court may allow such trustee not more than one-half commissions on the moneys or property received by him.

And insert:

Four per cent on moneys in excess of \$500 and less than \$1,500, 2 per cent on moneys in excess of \$1,500 and less than \$10,000, and 1 per cent on moneys in excess of \$10,000. And in case of the confirmation of a composition after the trustee has qualified the court may allow him, as compensation, not to exceed one-half of 1 per cent of the amount to be paid the creditors on such composition.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 11. That subdivision a of section 48 of said act be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"a Trustees shall receive for their services, payable after they are rendered, a fee of \$5 deposited with the clerk at the time the petition is filed in each case, except when a fee is not required from a voluntary bankrupt, and from estates which they have administered such commissions on all moneys disbursed by them as may be allowed by the courts, not to exceed 6 per cent on the first \$500 or less, 4 per cent on moneys in excess of \$500 and less than \$1,500, 2 per cent on moneys in excess of \$1,500 and less than \$10,000, and 1 per cent on moneys in excess of \$10,000. And in case of the confirmation of a composition after the trustee has qualified the court may allow him, as compensation, not to exceed one-half of 1 per cent of the amount to be paid the creditors on such composition."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 10, before the word "have," to strike out "or section seventy, subdivision c;" so as to make section 12 read:

SEC. 12. That subdivision g of section 57 of said act be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"g The claims of creditors who have received preferences, voidable under section 60, subdivision b, or to whom conveyances, transfers, assignments, or incumbrances, void or voidable under section 67, subdivision e, have been made or given, shall not be allowed unless such creditors shall surrender such preferences, conveyances, transfers, assignments, or incumbrances."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 3, after the word "required," to strike out "or permitted, or, if not, from the date when the beneficiary takes notorious, exclusive, or continuous possession of the property transferred;" so as to read:

"a A person shall be deemed to have given a preference if, being insolvent, he has, within four months before the filing of the petition, or after the filing of the petition and before the adjudication, procured or suffered a judgment to be entered against himself in favor of any person, or made a transfer of any of his property, and the effect of the enforcement of such judgment or transfer will be to enable any one of his creditors to obtain a greater percentage of his debt than any other of such creditors of the same class. Where the preference consists in a transfer, such period of four months shall not expire until four months after the date of the recording or registering of the transfer, if by law such recording or registering is required."

"b If a bankrupt shall have given a preference, and the person receiving it, or to be benefited thereby, or his agent acting therein, shall have had reasonable cause to believe that it was intended thereby to give a preference, it shall be voidable by the trustee, and he may recover the property or its value from such person. And, for the purpose of such recovery, any court of bankruptcy, as hereinbefore defined, and any State court which would have had jurisdiction if bankruptcy had not intervened, shall have concurrent jurisdiction."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 16, before the word "clause," to strike out "subdivision a and;" and in line 18, before the word "hereby," to strike out "are" and insert "is;" and after line 18 to strike out:

"a The court shall order the trustee to pay all taxes legally due and owing by the bankrupt to the United States, State, county, district, or municipality, except such taxes as are a lien on a homestead claimed by or set off to him as exempt from being taken on execution, in advance of the payment of dividends to creditors, and upon filing the receipts of the proper public officers for such payment he shall be credited with the amount thereof, and in case any question arises as to the amount or legality of any such tax, the same shall be heard and determined by the court."

On page 12, line 7, after the word "recovered," to insert "for the benefit of the estate of the bankrupt;" and in line 9, after the word "such," to strike out "creditors in so doing" and insert "recovery;" so as to make section 14 read:

SEC. 14. That clause 2 of subdivision b of section 64 of said act be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"(2) The filing fees paid by creditors in involuntary cases, and, where property of the bankrupt, transferred or concealed by him either before or after the filing of the petition, shall have been recovered for the benefit of the estate of the bankrupt by the efforts and at the expense of one or more creditors, the reasonable expenses of such recovery."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 10, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 15. That subdivision b of section 65 be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"The first dividend shall be declared within thirty days after the adjudication, if the money of the estate in excess of the amount necessary to pay the debts which have priority and such claims as have not been, but probably will be, allowed equals 5 per cent or more of such allowed claims. Dividends subsequent to the first shall be declared upon like terms as the first and as often as the amount shall equal 10 per cent or more and upon closing the estate. Dividends may be declared oftener and in smaller proportions if the judge shall so order. Provided, That the first dividend shall not include more than 50 per cent of the money of the estate in excess of the amount necessary to pay the debts which have priority and such claims as probably will be allowed: And provided further, That the final dividend shall not be declared within three months after the first dividend shall be declared."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 4, to change the number of the section from 15 to 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 12, to change the number of the section from 16 to 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 23, after the word "dockets," to strike out the comma and "as well as the indexes of judgments in the several courts of the United States;" and on page 14, line 1, after the word "corporations," to strike out "for

the purpose of transcription or otherwise;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 17. That said act is also amended by adding thereto a new section, section 71, to read as follows:

"SEC. 71. That the clerks of the several district courts of the United States shall prepare and keep in their respective offices complete and convenient indexes of all petitions and discharges in bankruptcy heretofore or hereafter filed in the said courts, and shall, when requested so to do, issue certificates of search certifying as to whether or not any such petitions or discharges have been filed; and said clerks shall be entitled to receive for such certificates the same fees as now allowed by law for certificates as to judgments in said courts: *Provided*, That said bankruptcy indexes and dockets shall at all times be open to inspection and examination by all persons or corporations without any fee or charge therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 4, to change the number of the section from 17 to 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 72. *Provided*, That when the bankrupt in any State has waived his right to claim his exempt property, to his creditors, the bankruptcy court shall not set apart to him this exemption as against said creditors.

And insert:

SEC. 72. That neither the referee nor the trustee shall in any form or guise receive, nor shall the court allow them, any other or further compensation for their services than that expressly authorized and prescribed in this act.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 18. That said act is also amended by adding thereto a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 72. That neither the referee nor the trustee shall in any form or guise receive, nor shall the court allow them, any other or further compensation for their services than that expressly authorized and prescribed in this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 13, to insert as a new section:

SEC. 19. That the provisions of this amendatory act shall not apply to bankruptcy cases pending when this act takes effect, but such cases shall be adjudicated and disposed of conformably to the provisions of the said act of July 1, 1898.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MALLORY. I should like to inquire if there has been a report made with this bill.

Mr. HOAR. There has been no written report. The changes in the bill are very simple. They are all in the line of ameliorating the condition of the bankrupt and diminishing the fees. Here is the main and important feature of the bill: The Supreme Court has decided by one majority that a creditor can not prove his claim if he has received a payment on any debt against the debtor; that is, if the debtor's property is not equal to his debts. Even if he received it innocently and without reason to believe the debtor's insolvency, he must surrender it before he can prove an undisputed claim. An important feature of the bill corrects that.

Mr. MALLORY. It seems, however, that this amends the present bankruptcy law in very many particulars; in fact, it seems to be a revision of the bankruptcy law. Of course I have not had an opportunity to give it consideration. This is the first time my attention has been called to it.

Mr. HOAR. The committee has given it very thorough inquiry and the minority, while they are not proposing to vote for it, gave notice that they did not desire to debate it or to make any opposition to it.

Mr. MALLORY. That is the attitude of the minority of the Judiciary Committee?

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to yield to me to secure the passage of a short Texas court bill, containing not over a dozen sentences.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to say, in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Texas, that I have no objection to his request, but I had assented to the reception by the Senate, if it were willing to do so, of the bills of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS] and of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. CULBERSON. I am perfectly willing to wait.

Mr. QUAY. Following the disposition of their legislation I will not object to the request of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Texas after he recognizes the Senator from Alabama.

CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AT MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 14839) providing that the circuit court of appeals of the fifth judicial circuit of the United States

shall hold at least one term of said court annually in the city of Montgomery, in the State of Alabama, on the first Monday in September in each year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was read in full this morning. Is there objection to its consideration?

Mr. FOSTER of Louisiana. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana objects to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PETTUS subsequently said: I understand, sir, that objection has been withdrawn to House bill 14839.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection made to the bill which the Senator from Alabama called to the attention of the Senate the Senator now informs the Senate has been withdrawn. The bill has been read. Is there objection to its consideration?

There being no objection the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WESTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6595) fixing the time and places for holding regular terms of the United States circuit and district courts in the western district of Virginia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, to strike out section 2, in the following words:

SEC. 2. That the circuit and district judges for the western district of Virginia shall appoint one clerk, who shall be clerk both of the circuit and district courts and shall reside and keep his office in the city of Roanoke; and shall appoint another clerk, who shall be clerk both of the circuit and district courts and shall reside and keep his office in the city of Charlottesville, said clerks in said respective cities to take charge and custody of the court records and papers, attending the sessions of the said courts, issuing all proper process, and discharging all the clerical duties in connection with the business of said courts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 15506) to amend section 14 of an act entitled "An act to divide the State of Texas into four judicial districts."

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASHTABULA HARBOR, OHIO.

Mr. QUAY. Now I ask for the regular order.

Mr. HANNA. I ask for the consideration of the bill (S. 7034) providing for the expenditure of money hitherto appropriated for the improvement and maintenance of Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio. I will state briefly that this is simply a change of the appropriation for Ashtabula Harbor; it is recommended by the Engineer Department; the contracts are about to be made, and it is very important that it should be acted upon now.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It provides that of the money appropriated for the improvement and maintenance of the harbor of Ashtabula, Ohio, in the act approved June 13, 1902, making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, so much as may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be deemed desirable may be expended in the extension of the west breakwater.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator rise to this bill?

Mr. QUAY. I do not. I just rose for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

Mr. QUAY. I ask for the regular order.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will the Senator allow me to give a notice? I wish to give notice that after the routine morning business tomorrow I shall move that the Senate take up and proceed with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12199) to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States.

COURTS IN MISSOURI.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is a little bill here which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. It once passed the House and the Senate and went to the President and a mistake was discovered in it. It was reported by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] the other morning and objected to by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. It is a very short bill. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will allow it to be passed by unanimous consent, laying the regular order temporarily aside.

Mr. QUAY. I will not object to the bill the Senator from Missouri desires to call up, but after it is disposed of I shall insist upon the regular order.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 7033) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a new division in the western judicial district of the State of Missouri," approved January 24, 1901.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill has been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. ALDRICH. Let it be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATEHOOD BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania demands the regular order. The regular order is the bill known as the statehood bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12543) to enable the people of Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to form constitutions and State governments and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, we are now ready to take a vote on this bill if nothing further is to be said upon it. Of course, I am not disposed to stop discussion in this highest tribunal of the world.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM] spoke for nearly three hours to-day. He has not had an opportunity to finish his speech. I submit in all fairness and courtesy he ought to have a chance to finish his speech in the morning, and that it is out of all reason to insist at this time, in view of these facts, that we shall go on with the bill.

Mr. QUAY. Well, that question was practically determined by a vote of the Senate. I as much as any other Senator upon this floor am disposed to be courteous to the Senator from New Hampshire, and I listened with much interest to his remarks. But it is patent to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that if one Senator upon the part of the opposition to the statehood bill is to be allowed to occupy two or three days and if a very large multitude of them, as I understand the Senator from Indiana, are to occupy the floor on the question, it is not worth while to prosecute the bill any further.

A conclusion, no matter what it may be, ought to be reached upon the bill. If it is to be defeated I would be glad to have it done, in order that the brushwood may be cleared out of the front of important national legislation pending.

As to the immediate proposition of the Senator from Minnesota, I can not say that I will antagonize it, though it was my purpose when I came here to insist upon a session of the Senate continuously during the day and during the night. If the Senator from New Hampshire can not go forward, and if the Senator from Indiana is not prepared to furnish a substitute, I will have no objection to allowing the statehood bill to be put aside for the present informally, without disturbing its place, with the understanding that at the conclusion of the morning business I am going to move to take it up again, and that I will not yield to-morrow. I hope the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] will be prepared to put up his men.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SPOONER. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. LODGE. No; let us have an executive session.

Mr. BURTON. I hope I may be allowed to call up a short bill. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. SPOONER. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. LODGE. Let us have an executive session.

Mr. SPOONER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BURTON. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to allow me to bring forward a bill which has already passed Congress once and was vetoed by the President under a misapprehension of the facts? It is a short bill of only one page.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator withdraw his motion?

Mr. SPOONER. I withdraw the motion.

CENTRAL ARIZONA RAILWAY.

Mr. BURTON. I ask unanimous consent to call up Senate bill 6968, a bill of only one page.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator says the bill was vetoed.

Mr. BURTON. But it was done under a misapprehension. The Department formerly reported against the bill, but the Department is now satisfied with the bill and recommends it.

Mr. CULLOM. What is it about?

Mr. BURTON. It is a bill granting the Central Arizona Railway Company a right of way for railroad purposes through the San Francisco Mountains Forest Reserve, in the Territory of Arizona. It passed both Houses of Congress.

Mr. CULLOM. What is the occasion for its being here now?

Mr. BURTON. The Committee on Public Lands recommended that the bill be passed over the President's veto, and instead of doing that I introduced a new bill.

Mr. CULLOM. Complying with the provisions of the veto?

Mr. BURTON. After submitting it to the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior, I introduced a new bill.

Mr. SPOONER. Do they recommend it?

Mr. BURTON. I have not letters, but they stated that there is no objection to the bill.

Mr. SPOONER. Is there a written recommendation?

Mr. BURTON. No, sir; there is not a written recommendation.

Mr. CARMACK. The Committee on Public Lands reported the bill?

Mr. BURTON. Yes; the committee reported it. It has been very fully considered by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that, as the bill has been vetoed, we ought to have some information in regard to it.

Mr. BURTON. Our committee unanimously recommended that the bill be passed over the President's veto.

Mr. LODGE. It is conceivable that some one might differ with the committee.

Mr. BURTON. That is quite true, but it is a bill which consists of only a few lines and—

Mr. LODGE. Even Senators who are not on the committee, of course, have a right to look at the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Certainly. It is a short bill and I do not think there will be any objection to it, if you will hear the bill read.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to hearing the bill read, but I reserve the right to object.

Mr. HOAR. Does not the Constitution require us to take a vote on a bill which the President has vetoed? Can a committee simply substitute a new bill?

Mr. BURTON. We did not substitute a new bill; that is, I simply introduced a new bill.

Mr. HOAR. I understand.

Mr. CARMACK. Is it identical with the old bill?

Mr. BURTON. It is substantially identical. It is in the same line.

Mr. HOAR. Can we get away from the President's veto in that manner?

Mr. BURTON. The bill was vetoed, as I have stated, at the suggestion of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. Now the same office is satisfied with the bill. It is not in the exact language of the bill that has been passed. It was changed a little merely to make it a new bill. I preferred, and the committee preferred, a new bill rather than to take action on the old one.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to ask the Senator whether it was so changed as to meet the objection which the President made to it, or is this an attempt by the introduction of a new bill to change it a little so as to make it nominally a new bill to go around the veto?

Mr. BURTON. In fact, to be candid, the object is to pass a new bill rather than to present the question on the veto.

Mr. SPOONER. I move that—

Mr. BURTON. I am satisfied that if Senators will hear the bill read there will be no objection to it. There were no objections to it in our committee.

Mr. HOAR. I do not want to interfere with the Senator's bill, and I shall not, but I should like to be allowed to say that I do not fancy the practice which has grown up, and for which the Senator from Kansas is not in the least responsible (I dare say we are all alike responsible), of stating what is the opinion of any head of a department or what is the opinion of the President of the United States himself about measures pending in this or the other House. There is a constitutional method by which the President conveys his approbation or disapproval of bills, and outside of that method I hold it to be contrary to the privileges of the Senate to have the opinion of the President of the United

States stated in legislation. The House of Commons or the House of Lords always resent it, and have in history done so for a great many years, when that statement is made about the Crown.

Now, when the President has formally communicated to us a veto and has not under his right to communicate to us his opinion and recommendation said anything else, I do not think it is within the limits of Senatorial privilege to say that the head of a department, or especially the head of a bureau like the Land Office, thinks the President made a mistake and after all we ought to pass the bill.

I do not care so much about that, but the great newspapers all over the country are informing us that certain bills are Administration bills, and that certain Senators have been at the White House and have arranged with the President of the United States what the Senate shall do about a treaty or about a trust bill, or about some other important matter of legislation. It is nobody's business to be arranging with the President of the United States what the Senate shall do. We are an independent body. The time for the President to make up his mind about statutes is after we have passed them, and not before, except when he avails himself of his constitutional privilege and makes a communication to the entire body by a message, as the Constitution provides.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Massachusetts is absolutely right, of course. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator allow me to make a statement with regard to this bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin moves that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator let me make a suggestion? I want to withdraw the bill and make a statement. Will the Senator permit me to do that for a moment?

Mr. SPOONER. For that purpose I withdraw the motion for a moment.

Mr. BURTON. Of course the motion to adjourn is not debatable, and I do not want to debate it.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that this bill seems to provoke discussion on the method in which it is brought here, so far as I am concerned I will not press it. It is not my measure at all, I will say; it is not personal to me in the least. I will not ask to have the bill considered at this time; but if Senators prefer that course, I will ask the consideration of the bill that has been vetoed. I have brought the bill forward in perfect good faith. I did not suppose there was any objection to the measure. But certainly I do not want to bring the bill forward under the rule of general consent when it would provoke discussion. Therefore I will not press the bill any further.

Mr. SPOONER. I renew my motion that the Senate adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 22, 1903, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 21, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FUR-BEARING ANIMALS IN ALASKA.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reprint of the bill (H. R. 13387) to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska, with the accompanying report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the reprint of the bill H. R. 13387, with the accompanying report. If there is no objection, this order will be made.

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE COINAGE.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15520, the Philippine coinage bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TAWNEY in the chair.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] may control one half of the time allowed for general debate and that I be allowed to control the other half.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] control one half of the time for general debate, and that he control the remaining half. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, how much time has been exhausted upon this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed thirty-nine minutes of his time.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I mentioned some of the objections which have been urged by experts and by others familiar with the conditions in the Philippines against the immediate introduction into the islands of the United States coinage system, complete. There was one objection which I omitted to mention yesterday—the danger of counterfeiting. That danger is easily understood upon an examination of the facts.

The pending bill provides for a Philippine silver peso, the bullion value of which would be approximately 37 cents and the face value 50 cents in gold, a difference of 13 cents. The proposed substitute bill provides for a silver dollar, the bullion value of which would be approximately 36 or possibly 37 cents, while its face value would be 100 cents in gold, a difference of 63 or 64 cents per dollar. That margin of 63 or 64 cents would offer a great inducement, so the experts told us, for the skilled mechanics and jewelers of China and Japan, where labor is very cheap, to indulge in the counterfeiting of the American silver dollar.

One of these men could make silver dollars in China or Japan and his detection would be almost impossible. Indeed, through the Straits Settlements and in Java to-day they are troubled with counterfeit silver coin, although there the difference between the bullion and face value is nothing like the difference which would result if we were to adopt the proposed substitute bill of the gentleman from Virginia. That, in the opinion of the Taft Commission, and especially of Governor Taft and of Vice-Governor Wright, both of whom have testified before the committee, is a most serious objection, under present conditions, to the establishing of the United States coinage system in the Philippine Islands.

There is another objection which was forcefully presented by Mr. Peabody. And for the information of gentlemen who were not present yesterday I desire to say that Mr. Peabody is not a mere theorist, but that, on the contrary, he is a practical business man, at the head of a firm which has establishments in Boston, New York, Yucatan, Manila, London, and South Africa—in fact, around the world; a man who has had commercial relations with the Philippine government through his house in Manila, and whose experience has given him an accurate and profound knowledge of the financial conditions and needs of the islands.

That man, a conservative New England business man, declared himself against the proposition to introduce the United States system of coinage complete into the Philippines.

I read from the record of his testimony:

Would the system proposed by the bill be preferable to the one providing for the introduction of the American money, the complete system?

He replied as follows:

The introduction of American coinage as a whole would work a great hardship and would be almost impossible to adjust.

That corroborates the statement of Governor Taft, which I read yesterday, wherein he declared, before our committee, that abruptly to attempt to introduce the American coinage system as a whole into the Philippines would result in nothing short of financial disaster. And this declaration of Governor Taft's is in turn corroborated by the statement of Professor Jenks, a part of which I read yesterday. And as this statement comes from an expert of world-wide repute, who visited the Philippines, the Straits Settlements, India, and Java for the purpose of investigating financial conditions, I desire once more to call it to the attention of members of the House.

Before reading it, Mr. Chairman, I desire again to remind members of the committee of the difference between these two bills; a margin of 13 or 14 cents only between the bullion and the face value of the silver pesos proposed by our committee bill, and a margin of 63 or 64 cents between the face and the bullion value of the dollar proposed by the minority substitute.

And, by the way, this substitute was never presented to the committee. There is no minority report. The substitute was not even introduced into the House until after the pending measure had been reported.

But, says Professor Jenks, the expert sent to the Orient by the War Department:

It is desirable, whenever a country is to establish a new system of currency, that the value of the coin most common in circulation be changed as little as possible. The wages of labor and prices already fixed are to a considerable extent matters of custom. If a monetary unit is introduced of considerably more value—

And the minority substitute would establish one of considerably more value—

than the one abandoned, it will be necessary to make a nominal reduction of wages and prices. The consequence is that laborers and less well-informed sellers of produce will feel that their income is being arbitrarily lessened and great dissatisfaction is almost certain to be the result. One can easily see how a sudden action of that kind on the part of a government might produce even a revolution among people not well informed on monetary matters.

Then he adds what I omitted to read yesterday:

If the new currency, however, is one whose monetary unit is substantially the same or only a trifle higher than the one already employed, no evil result will follow. There might even be a slight increase in the value of the monetary unit, which would inure to the benefit of the wage-earners and the local producers. The system of currency recommended in the first place by the Philippine Commission—

That is the system of the pending bill—

And afterwards formulated more completely by Mr. Conant, special commissioner of the War Department, follows out this principle. The new coin would be substantially equal in value to the Mexican dollar or peso formerly in use.

That is the coin of the pending bill, gentlemen. Then he adds:

It seems, therefore, the wisest plan for the United States, if it intends to act in the interest of the native Filipinos and not exclusively for the interest of a comparatively few exporters and bankers, to adopt the gold standard and adopt the system of coinage recommended, which will produce as little disturbance as any that has been proposed. It is extremely unfortunate that the system could not have been adopted before the last fall in silver, as in that case there would have been no disturbance that would have been noticed.

The House did propose to adopt this system, Mr. Chairman, prior to the late fall in silver. We passed a gold-standard bill through the House last June, which, if it had been enacted into law, would have saved that archipelago from its present financial distress. As you know, it was blocked in the Senate, which demanded the free coinage of silver. The House absolutely refused to accept that, and so the status quo remains.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BABCOCK. What is the relative weight of the proposed Philippine peso as compared with the present standard silver dollar?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The present standard silver dollar has 412½ grains of silver and the peso would have 416 grains, the same as the Mexican dollar, the coin now principally in use in the islands.

In referring to the Straits Settlement, Professor Jenks says:

In 1897 a committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Singapore was appointed to prepare a report regarding the change of standard. A majority of the committee reported in favor of the adoption of a gold standard with the English sovereign as a basis, with a Straits silver dollar equivalent to 2 shillings of value, and in favor of some measure of maintaining this fixed rate of exchange.

The opposition came in part from the bankers, who have probably gained from the fluctuations in exchange. * * * The Chinese merchants favor the fluctuating silver currency.

In Java—

Says Professor Jenks—

its silver guilder is maintained at a fixed rate of exchange with gold, and its business men are free from the speculative influences and other disadvantages which accompany a violent fluctuating rate of exchange.

He says:

The standard is a gold standard, and although the exchange has kept substantially fixed throughout the entire period of the relative fall in the price of silver, gold is practically not at all in circulation in Netherlands India. A gold coin, even an English sovereign, is rarely seen. * * * The Java Bank holds a large reserve in gold, but it is not paid out on demand.

Mr. Chairman, I have recently received, as I understand members of the House have generally received, copies of the Manila Cable News, a daily paper published in Manila. I have here the second section of it, which contains a page devoted to an article under the headlines:

Wreck and disaster caused by depreciated currency in the Philippines—Business ruined and advancement retarded—The government has lost more than a million dollars—Loss to citizens incalculable—Views of prominent business men on the situation—The conditions clearly explained.

In the center is a picture of Governor Taft, and below it this statement:

Governor Taft believes that a stable currency is essential to the well-being of the Philippines. He favors the coinage of the Conant dollar and the issuance of treasury notes for the purchase of Mexican silver as bullion for coinage.

This article contains interviews with business men in Manila. One of them of prominence says:

Although I was one of the members of the American Chamber of Commerce who voted for gold alone, I believe the introduction of the gold and what is known as the Conant dollar would afford an impetus to the trade of the Philippines which we can not well do without.

He says:

Our business suffered from the change, as when the prices of articles were quoted to customers in gold and figured out in Mexican at the Government rate it seemed abnormally high to the natives, and in many cases they have turned on their heels and walked out of the store. Another phase of this: The native and the Chinaman, having been accustomed to the peso, often flatly refused to consider gold prices, and when a price was quoted to them in gold they offered double the amount of dollars in pesos, and when their attention was called to the rate of exchange, they ignored it and refused to purchase.

Another witness, Mr. Guamis, a Spaniard connected with a large business house in Manila, gave as his opinion that—

We want the gold standard, with an additional coin. This additional coin will be useful in the provinces, where the native has not yet been accustomed to the American money. It is simply impossible to convince the native from the start that an American 10-cent piece is worth as much as a peseta.

The peseta would be practically the same in size as a 20-cent piece in American money, but its value would be only that of an American 10-cent piece.

This man, speaking from experience, declares that—

It is practically impossible to convince the natives on the start that an American 10-cent piece is worth as much as a peseta.

Another witness, Mr. Cadwallader, connected with an extensive business house in Manila, says:

As to the "Conant" dollar, I believe it is just the thing for the Philippines. The straight gold will not do. The natives must have a coin similar to the Mexican dollar. They can not be made to understand that our money is worth just twice as much as the Mexican. I am heartily in favor of the introduction of the "Conant" dollar, and believe it to be the only solution of the problem. I have been here over four years, during which time I have had an opportunity to study the labor question, and I believe I understand it thoroughly. I have employed both Chinese and native labor and know just what to expect from them. When I say they will not accept the American money, I know what I am talking about. We must have an additional coin.

Other men who were interviewed say the same thing. There was one gentleman interviewed who told the newspaper that he thought we ought to introduce at once the American coinage system complete. Among other things, he said:

Now, suppose I owed a native a peseta, and I laid down a peseta and a 10-cent piece, side by side. He would pick up the peseta, of course; but if I refused to pay him in Mexican, and gave him the 10-cent piece, what would be the result? He would finger the dime suspiciously and grumble. However, when he went to a store, presented his 10-cent piece, and asked for that much rice he would receive a peseta's worth.

He begs the whole question in that. There would be "grumbling," as various witnesses testify, but the man would not get the peseta's worth of rice. That is one of the troubles which it is expected would obtain in these islands if we arbitrarily force American money on them. Governor Taft has often said that it is of the utmost importance that no disturbing element be injected into the life of the Filipino people. Nothing could bring disquiet more quickly than to introduce a system of money, which a large portion of the people would imagine was doing them a great wrong.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I wish to reiterate what I said a moment ago, that, in my opinion, if this bill does not pass the House and go to the Senate, there will be no coinage system enacted for the Philippine archipelago at this session. The reasons are plain. The time is too short, and the calendars too congested to admit of our beginning over again. Moreover, the Senate Committee on the Philippines would not report any such bill as that proposed by the gentleman from Virginia.

I do not wish to impute wrongful motives to anybody, but I can readily understand how some persons might wish all financial legislation for these islands to fail at this session. Bankers there would reap a great benefit as a result of such a failure. Business ruin would come to many others. That ruin would produce effects there and entail results political here which no man can foretell. In any event it would furnish a war cry upon the stump in this country which might be made very effective where people do not understand the circumstances.

But, Mr. Chairman, I, as a member of this House, would consider long and well before casting my vote to defeat the pending bill and to enact the substitute into law against the protest of the Philippine Commission, headed by such a man as is William H. Taft. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman whether or not this system which is proposed in this bill is intended as a permanent system or as a temporary system for the islands?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. As I understand it, we enact this law to meet conditions now pressing in the Philippines. It will, I think, be the coinage system of the archipelago for many years. That was the opinion of Mr. Peabody, and it is the opinion of every man who has thoroughly investigated the situation.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I would like to ask whether or not in the system which you propose there is a provision for any coinage of less size than 10 cents?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has evidently forgotten the Philippine civil government act of last July, in which we provided for subsidiary money for the archipelago.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I think I know the provisions of that act.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It provides for the coinage of a 5-centavo, a centavo, and a half-centavo piece.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Before the gentleman takes his seat, I would like to ask him a question. I see in the report a statement that five of the banking houses in which there was sought an interview declined to give an interview. I would like to know if the gentleman has any knowledge why they refused, and if so, I would like to have him state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Indiana will discover, if he reads the evidence, that the witnesses who appeared before the Insular Committee and testified on this subject, and the experts who have reported specifically upon these propositions, say that the only people now in the islands who are making any money out of the financial disorganization are the bankers. They are, therefore, directly and peculiarly interested in maintaining the status quo.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to ask the gentleman what is the currency—what is the amount of silver that is now current in the Philippines?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, they have about forty millions of silver, of which six millions is what is called the Spanish Filipino peso. The balance are Mexican pesos. The Mexican is a coin of 416 grains. The Spanish Filipino peso is somewhat lighter.

Mr. PERKINS. What is the current value of the Mexican peso now?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, the ratio is somewhere about 260.

Mr. PERKINS. What value is given to that by your bill?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Two to one.

Mr. PERKINS. In other words, you increase the value?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes, sir.

Mr. PERKINS. Then the result of this bill would be to increase the purchasing value of \$40,000,000 of silver currency by about how many per cent?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman can figure that out himself.

Mr. PERKINS. Say 25 per cent?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. We make a difference of 13 cents in the peso. It is now worth 37 cents; we make it worth 50 cents.

Mr. PERKINS. Then the result is that the holders of \$40,000,000 of coin will by this bill have the value of that coin increased about 30 per cent?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not think it will amount to that when it comes to purchasing labor or products. The Commission is—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will my colleague on the committee allow me a suggestion?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Allow me to say that the Commission, by this bill, is allowed to fix the rate at which the Mexican coins are to be received in payment of obligations.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me suggest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] that under this bill the current value of the pesos in the archipelago will not be increased a single farthing.

Mr. PERKINS. Why not?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Because they pass at their commercial value and are received for taxes and public dues at a rate fixed by the insular government, and as they are so received they will be taken out of circulation and recoined into new pesos, which shall have a value of 50 per cent of a gold dollar.

Mr. PERKINS. In other words, the old pesos will have to be presented for recoinage before they have their value under this bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes, sir. They have nothing but their commercial value until taken up and recoined, and the new coin is stabilized at 2 for 1 of the American gold dollar.

Mr. HILL. Why was the original provision of the Conant bill, submitted last year, which required the taking up of the Mexican pesos, now current in the island—why was that stricken out of this bill, so that that money is not to be taken up, so far as anything in the bill shows?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The discretion of taking up that currency is left to the Commission.

Mr. HILL. Why was the provision put in the other bill and left out of this?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It can make no kind of difference, because there was no provision in the other bill to exclude it from the archipelago. It would simply go there at the bullion value.

Mr. HILL. In the other bill it was distinctly provided that it should be taken up and recoined into the coin provided for in the bill. That is all left out here.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. My understanding is that in the other bill it was provided that this coinage should be received for public dues at a certain rate of exchange; that it should be recoined; and then (if the bill does not expressly say so the meaning is the same thing) that the Government should either coin the Mexican peso that has been received in the course of business or shall buy bullion and coin these new dollars. So that in effect the two bills on that proposition are the same.

Mr. HILL. Then it was left out accidentally, not intentionally?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No, sir.

Mr. HILL. Not for any specific purpose?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; for no specific purpose. I think the matter is immaterial.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In view of the questions of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] I wish to call their attention to this provision of the bill:

That the Mexican silver peso now in use in the Philippine Islands, and the silver coins heretofore issued by the Spanish Government for use in said islands, shall be receivable for public dues and in the discharge of all debts, public and private, at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the proclamation of the civil governor of said islands until such date, not earlier than the 31st day of December, 1903, as may be fixed by public proclamation of said civil governor, when such coins shall cease to be so receivable for public dues; but such coins shall continue to be receivable at such rate for the payment of private debts contracted in such money before the 1st day of June, 1903: *Provided*, That the public offices of the government of said islands may at any time refuse to receive such coins which appear to be counterfeit or defective.

Now, in reply to the question of the gentleman from Connecticut, as to the conditions under which these Mexican coins will be coined, I refer him to the beginning of section 5, where it is provided—

That the coinage authorized by this act shall be subject to the conditions and limitations of the provisions of the act of July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes."

That is the Philippine civil government act.

Now, let me refer to this provision of that act:

The subsidiary silver coins authorized by the preceding section shall be coined under the authority of the government of the Philippine Islands, as such amounts may be determined, with the approval of the Secretary of War of the United States, from silver bullion purchased by said government.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman will not find in that act what he is looking for. It has been taken out.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. HILL. The provision of the original act.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There never was any provision in the original bill for the complete redemption of the Mexican coins in the Philippine Archipelago.

Mr. HILL. I will ask the gentleman this question. In the original bill—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. One moment. The gentleman has assumed that a fact existed which never did exist. There never was anybody who proposed to redeem all of the Mexicans in the Philippine Archipelago. The gentleman has assumed that in the question which he propounded to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. HILL. Not at all, not at all. I will ask the gentleman this question: In the original bill, as presented by Mr. Conant, and heard before the Philippine Committee, was there not a provision for taking up the Mexican coins in the archipelago and recoinage them, together with the Spanish coin which was in the archipelago? Now then, in this bill, has not that provision been distinctly stricken out and the new coinage limited to purchases of bullion? Am I right, or am I not right?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That, as I understand, would not make the slightest difference in the world with the enforcement of the provisions of this law.

Mr. HILL. Am I right, or am I not right?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That may be right.

Mr. HILL. Yes; that is what I thought. What is the motive which has prompted that change from taking up the existing coinage to the purchase of additional American silver bullion?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. One moment—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not believe the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is right on the record.

Mr. HILL. The chairman of the committee admits that I am right on the record.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. One moment. My impression is also that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is entirely mistaken. The first question which he asked gave everybody, as I presume, as it did me, to understand that there was to be a redemption of the Mexicans in the islands.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman will recall that he appeared before the Committee on Insular Affairs, that he made certain statements which so misled Mr. Conant that Mr. Conant arose and repudiated, as he thought, the suggestion of the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. In what respect?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That there should be a redemption of the Mexicans in the island. He said that could not be done; that Mexico coins the Mexican pesos; that they are not coined in the Philippine Archipelago, and nobody knows how many would be shipped there if we undertook to redeem them.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, not by way of criticism, but entirely for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. It is contemplated that a large amount of silver pesos will be issued by the Philippine government. Where does the chairman of the committee suppose that the silver which is to be used will be obtained, and how will the silver be obtained which is to be used in the new coinage? I ask for information.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think the bill amply covers that. It declares that the coinage provided for under it may be coined under the same conditions provided for in the act of last July. The act of last July contains the following language:

That said government may in addition and in its discretion recoin the Spanish Filipino dollars and subsidiary silver coins issued under the authority of the Spanish Government for use in said islands into subsidiary coins provided for in the preceding section.

Mr. HILL. Why, there is not any of that Spanish coin to amount to anything.

Mr. McDERMOTT. What becomes of your Mexican dollar under this bill?

Mr. HILL. You tell me. There is nothing in the bill to provide for it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

[Mr. JONES of Virginia addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], the chairman of this committee, in concluding his speech a few moments ago, said to the House, although it was probably not understood on this side, but was to the members on the other side, that there was some attempt or at least some idea on the part of the majority of the committee to make political capital out of this bill. In other words, he said to the people on that side of the House, "Unless you pass this bill I offer, then there will be no bill passed at all," and that we, the minority, would be delighted to see it take that turn. I want to deny that absolutely, every word of it. So far as I myself am concerned, and so far as any member of the committee whom I have heard express himself on this question is concerned, there never has been any matter of partisanship or anything of that nature suggested, nor has there been any attempt to make any political capital out of it. We realize the condition in the Philippine Islands.

We understand and know that there must be some legislation there in order to correct the evils which are existing there, and I stand here to deny that assertion that we are attempting or have intimated by the position we take in this matter to make political capital out of it. Have we not done the same thing that we now offer for Porto Rico? Have we not done the same thing for Hawaii? Is there any political capital in that? I hope that gentlemen on that side of the House will disabuse their minds of any such idea. I wish to call attention to another fact. The chairman of the committee held up certain coins and undertook to explain to members on that side and upon this side of the House why it is that these Filipinos could not understand the difference between the sizes of these coins and their purchasing power. Now, I desire to read you something. He has been reading from the testimony of Mr. Peabody.

I wish to read you something which he asked Mr. Peabody, his own witness, in respect to that identical idea, and what the answer of Mr. Peabody was. Some of these theorists and some of these witnesses who have been over in the Philippine Islands and who were brought before our committee and some of whose reports were read, insisted that those people over there are ignorant. Who brought these witnesses here I do not know, but I suppose it was somebody who has an object to serve in having this bill framed in the manner in which it is submitted to this House today. As I say, they insist that those people over there are ignorant. In other words, if you have two silver dollars, one of which calls for 50 cents and the other for a dollar, that they can not understand or distinguish the difference between them, that they have not the capacity to do that. Recurring now to the testimony of Mr. Peabody given before our committee, the following took place:

Mr. CANNON. Is not an American silver dollar exchanged for two Mexicans, right there under his nose?

Mr. PEABODY. It would change for two and a half at present.

Mr. CANNON. Is not that done to-day?

Mr. PEABODY. But he is paid in the Mexican dollar.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. Now, does he not understand that? Does not everybody understand that if he has an American dollar he can get two and a half Mexicans for it?

Mr. PEABODY. They know the value of the coin they receive; yes, sir; but the question would be whether the millions of wage-earners would be contented or willing to see that the purchasing power of 40 cents in American money was as much as that of a dollar in Mexican silver.

The committee will see that the whole turn of this is on this wage idea which has been advanced by my colleague on the committee all along the line. I continue to read:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Peabody, right there permit me to say this, and tell me what you think of it: Governor Taft and Governor Wright say, on that point, that back in the country, where the millions of these people live who

are used only to silver in small quantities, if you were to take a silver piece of a certain size, the value of which they know to-day, and then take a piece of silver of practically the same size and the same weight with a little different stamp on it, and tell them that that coin of the same size and same weight was worth twice as much, there would be trouble. What do you think of that?

Now, mark that that is what the chairman says—that there would be trouble—suggesting that idea. And then he says: "What do you think of that?"

Mr. PEABODY. There would not be any trouble in any comparative value of the two coins in that way, because they would understand that. But if you attempted to change the rate of wages in two coins that looked exactly alike, and which appeared the same to them, and to withdraw one of them from circulation, there would be no opportunity of comparison after you had retired the Mexican dollar.

You see, they keep prominent the question of wages. Now, to go a little further, with Mr. Peabody still on the stand, Mr. CRUMPACKER takes him up:

Mr. PEABODY. But it would be a very much more simple problem to introduce a 50-cent peso in place of a 35-cent Mexican dollar than it would be to enforce a 100-cent United States dollar in place of a 35-cent peso.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, Mr. Peabody, do you not believe that in the course of six months or a year, if we extended even the American system down there as it is to-day, the people of the islands would learn the increased purchasing power, and that all affairs would be adjusted to the new situation?

Mr. PEABODY. Yes, sir; I think the legal change of adjustment of values at a stated rate would be understood by the most ignorant of the islanders if it applied to everybody.

You will notice that the witness there said that this would be understood by the most ignorant of the islanders, it would be understood by all of them, and the truth about it is, if I understand the situation there to-day, that they do understand it; and why should they not? We have our garrisons perhaps in every town and at every crossroads, or have had. They have come in contact with this American money in every direction and everywhere. They are bound to know of its increased purchasing power. They do know it, and now gentlemen say that they are afraid! In other words, the chairman of this committee read to you to-day from that distinguished expert, Professor Somebody, that if we make this radical change down there in this currency it will bring on a revolution or will be likely to do so. Now, is not that the most perfect humbug that was ever attempted to be put upon the Congress of the United States? Have we not changed their flag, have we not changed everything on God Almighty's earth down there except their money? And they have got none to change, as my colleague on the right suggests.

Gentlemen, they say that in order to get rid of friction, in order to have a stable currency down there, the majority bill must pass. I trust I am talking to men who will consider this matter, men who are going to think about this question before they vote. I want to ask the chairman and the gentlemen on the committee on that side who propose to support this bill this question: If your bill passes and becomes a law, 2 pesos, containing 416 grains of silver each, $3\frac{1}{4}$ grains heavier than our own silver dollar, are to pass for one of our dollars. Now, how in the name of high Heaven are you going to keep down the friction when we have our troops located there, in every part of the country, and are being paid off every month at the rate of not less than \$2,000,000, putting the United States currency into circulation there, and it is coming in contact and being constantly compared with their money? How are you going to prevent it? It seems to me, gentlemen, it is impossible.

Now, we have the evidence of their expert witnesses that these people know the difference, that they know the purchasing power of the American dollar and know that it is worth far more than theirs. They want a stable currency. They are entitled to it. We have given it to Porto Rico. Why, if I remember correctly General Porter's report to the Committee on Porto Rico on this subject it was that if we hurriedly rushed into this business and substituted the United States currency down there we would have another revolution or disturbance of some sort. But we did it. We redeemed the currency, took up their Porto Rican dollar, substituted our own, and I have never heard one word of objection to it up to this hour. The same thing is done in Hawaii. We took up their money and substituted ours, but now when you get down to the Philippine Islands they must have a regular crazy-quilt currency in order to meet the ideas of that distinguished advocate of the gold standard, Mr. Conant. Well, we put the gold standard down there ourselves when we introduced the currency of the United States. One gentleman suggested that we ought to have a United States Filipino coin. Would not that be good? How would it sound to have a United States Georgia coin?

Now, these are the ideas of some of these experts, some of these theorists. Practice is one thing, theory is another. Plenty of gentlemen were ready to say that we were going to destroy everything in Porto Rico. Probably they thought the same thing about Hawaii; but when the thing was put in practice we found that it was not so, that it did not work out as they anticipated it would.

Now, these gentlemen propose another thing. It has been suggested here by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McDERMOTT] that up to a certain time this Mexican coin, which is largely in circulation in these islands, shall be receivable for public dues and on private contracts, but nowhere does the majority bill propose to redeem and take up that currency that happens to be in the hands of the people of that country, either the business man or the laborer or anybody else. After a certain time it is to be absolutely outlawed so far as the laws of the country are concerned; it is to be worth no more than junk. Now, that is the proposition that they offer to the committee.

Another thing, gentlemen: In order to maintain the parity in this bill that is offered by the majority they authorized the Philippine Commission to issue interest-bearing certificates not to exceed the sum of \$5,000,000. That is done in order to maintain the parity between the silver pesos that they have authorized here and the standard gold dollar, so they say. They propose to go into the certificate business again. I have a recollection of about \$265,000,000 of bonds issued myself in order to maintain parity. At least that was claimed to be the purpose. Would gentlemen like to see this Government go into that business again? I do not, and I see no reason for it if our own currency is substituted for theirs. The fact is they have no currency to amount to anything, anyway.

Now, gentlemen, I have heard no one yet attempt to explain the question of maintaining the parity by issuing these certificates. Is there any reason for that? If they are redeemable in gold dollars, and with the United States behind them, there will never be any question or any necessity to maintain the parity as long as we have one standard. According to my ideas it is impossible for it to be otherwise. Now, I want to read this provision:

and in order to maintain such parity between said Philippine pesos and the gold coins of the United States may issue temporary certificates of indebtedness, bearing interest at a reasonable rate, payable at periods of three months or more, but not later than one year from the date of issue, which shall be in the denominations of \$50 or 100 pesos, or some multiple of such sum, and shall be redeemable in gold coin of the United States, or in lawful money of said islands, according to the terms of issue prescribed by the government of said islands; but the amount of such certificates outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$5,000,000.

Now, I call your attention to that provision in this law which probably many of you have not read, and to which your attention has not been called. You can consider that when you come to cast your vote for the majority or minority bill.

Now, the distinguished gentleman on the other side, as my colleague has said, has been acting very largely upon the recommendations of these gentlemen who appeared before them in the committee. Who sent them before the committee I do not know.

Mr. THAYER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. THAYER. How do those who are in favor of permitting the issue of that bond understand that the money received from the bond is to maintain the parity?

Mr. MADDOX. That is exactly what I am listening to hear some one on that side get up and explain. I do not understand that. Now, what I am calling the House's attention to here is that the difference between the majority bill offered to the House and that which the minority offers is that we substitute the currency of the United States. One of the ideas that the gentlemen who advocate the majority bill advance for not substituting American coinage is that they are afraid that some one will counterfeit it.

Mr. HILL. I would suggest that you ask, supplemental to that question asked by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as to how the five million is to be paid, for it has got to be paid sometime or other.

Mr. MADDOX. That is an important question, and yet it has got to be paid, as suggested. I reckon some of them on that side will offer an explanation. I admit that I cannot. They are offering as one of the reasons that they urge against adopting American coinage that it would be dangerous to do it, as that coin could be counterfeited.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Can not they counterfeit the local coin too?

Mr. MADDOX. This peso that they propose to coin and pass into the currency of the country is nothing but a token coin, and yet for some reason and for some purpose, I do not know what, they have raised it $3\frac{1}{4}$ grains because silver has declined. The idea occurred to them when they were arranging this bill that they were going to keep the two metals at a parity, but everybody knows that can not be done, that under existing laws silver vacillates every day.

The silver in that coin, according to their statement, is worth 36 cents, so there is a 14-cent margin between 36 cents and 50 cents in the token money. Would that be any inducement for a man

to counterfeit it? That is quite a lively per cent; and the gentleman from Wisconsin speaks like these Chinese are adepts in this counterfeiting. But gentlemen need not travel over there to find counterfeiters. We can find enough of them at home. Is there anything in that? It is true that there is a greater inducement so far as the difference between the value of American dollar over the proposed pesos, which is one-half, but is there not sufficient inducement in that to cause counterfeiting to go on just the same? Then, I undertake to say this, that the danger will be far greater for them to counterfeit United States coin than there will be for them to attempt to counterfeit the 50-cent pesos issued by the islands. They would counterfeit this peso, with more silver in it, with a difference of 14 cents in it, rather than to risk counterfeiting the United States coin, with the power of this great nation behind it.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I presume, Mr. Chairman, that we probably have used more time than the other side, and I suppose some gentleman over there will occupy some time now.

The CHAIRMAN. The other side, the Chair will state to the gentleman from Virginia, has already occupied more time than his.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee].

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to occupy the time of the committee only a moment to state my views on this subject. The affairs of the Philippine Islands at the present time are in what may be called a transitory state. So far as the business between the Philippine Islands and this country is concerned, it amounts in the way of business, as measured at this day, to practically nothing.

Now, the question for the House to determine is whether it is better in this transition period, when no considerable business is done with these islands, that it should have this anomalous Philippine currency or have the currency laws and the coinage laws of the United States extended and give to the people of the archipelago a fixed and stable currency. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if any considerable business between this country and the Philippine Islands should develop in the future that it is infinitely better, not only for this country, but for the people of those islands, to have our coinage laws extended there. If this bill as reported by the majority is to be temporary only the reason ought to be controlling, because if in the future it is to be supplanted by our coinage laws and our currency it will involve a greater disturbance than at the present time, when there is practically no business there, and the introduction of American money therefore would be comparatively easy. If the bill, however, is intended to be a permanent measure, then I take the position that this country ought to extend its coinage laws to every foot of land and to all the people within its control and dominions.

I believe the true policy of this country is to have free trade, absolutely, between all of its possessions and all and every part of the United States, and while I am opposed to the colony-holding business into which the Republic has been launched, yet, if we are to hold colonies, it occurs to me, in justice to ourselves and to them, our coinage laws should be extended to them, as well as free trade between our possessions and the United States.

I want to say another word, Mr. Chairman, and that is in answer to the criticism of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] that the minority was somewhat in fault in not having their bill at the time the majority bill was adopted by the committee. The fact was, as stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], I was present, and I made the motion in committee that the coinage laws of the United States be extended to the Philippine Islands, and gave notice that a bill would be prepared in accordance with the motion then made. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are other gentlemen who wish to speak on this subject. I will yield, as I only wanted time to state my position thus briefly.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how much time we have occupied on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one hour and ten minutes remaining to the affirmative side and one hour and twenty-five minutes remaining on the side of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

[Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the Committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have used on this side as much time as has been used on the other, and I think the chairman of the committee should use some of his time now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are seventy minutes remaining on each side.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we desire to close the general debate on this side, and I would like to have the gentleman from Virginia proceed if he can.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I realize, of course, that the gentleman will close the debate on that side, but I think he ought to use some of his time now. Several gentlemen on this side have spoken and, as yet, but one on that side.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield half an hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the first question for consideration in the logical order of this debate is whether a change of standard in the currency of the Philippine Islands is desirable at this time. The other side of the Chamber seems to be divided upon that very important proposition. The minority members of the Committee on Insular Affairs recommend the adoption of a bill extending the American system of currency into the archipelago, and I assume that the majority of the opposition side will support that measure. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] who has just addressed the committee, is opposed to any change at all, as I understand from his remarks.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I believe, if the gentleman will permit me, that the adoption of the American system is better than the proposed bill, but I am opposed to the passage of any bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It seems, from the situation there and the testimony of men competent to judge of conditions, that a more stable currency is imperatively demanded by all of the interests of the islands. A stable currency is necessary to a prosperous business condition in any country, and the fact that the Republic of Mexico may have prospered to a considerable degree in spite of her currency system argues nothing against the principle that a sound currency is one of the indispensable requisites to the best and highest conditions of trade and commerce in any civilization.

In the Philippine Archipelago there has been great business disturbances on account of the constant downward tendency of silver. The standard of value is silver, and they have what we understand to be free coinage, and the currency of the archipelago goes at its bullion value.

When the Taft Civil Commission assumed control of affairs in the archipelago the rate of exchange between gold and the Mexican peso and the Spanish peso in the islands was about two to one. In view of the fact that the operations of this Government in the islands required a considerable volume of money, and large amounts were sent from here there, it was necessary to fix by governmental authority a ratio at which public officers might receive the current coins of the country.

The ratio was first fixed at 2 to 1. That was on the 1st day of December, 1901. Since then the ratio has been changed 7 times. On the 26th day of December, 1901, the depreciation of silver was such that the official ratio was fixed at 2.10. March 27, 1902, it was fixed at 2.27. July 7, 1902, it was fixed at 2.35. September 3, 1902, it was fixed at 2.40. October 22, 1902, it was fixed at 2.46. November 11, last, it was fixed at 2.50, and November 23, the last record that I have, the rate of exchange was fixed at 2.60.

These frequent and radical changes illustrate the disastrous effect of a currency that has such a rapid depreciation as Philippine silver has had during the last year, and the evidence before the Insular Committee shows that, notwithstanding the official rate of exchange is 2.60 to 1, the bank rate is, and has been for some time, from 2.68 to 2.72. The Government overvalues the current coin in its official rate, and is receiving the Spanish peso and the Philippine peso in lieu of gold at more than their real value, and during the last year it has lost over a million dollars in the depreciation of the coins that it has collected and received for public taxes and revenues in the archipelago.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the gentleman will yield for a minute, does not the gentleman recognize that all taxes are practically paid by products, and that if the money depreciates it takes that much more of products?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, in its final analysis the gentleman may be theoretically correct; but when a government imposes a fixed rate of taxation and it is to be paid in current money, all of its estimates and calculations are based upon the supposition of a fixed purchasing power, and when such depreciation occurs between the time the tax rate is fixed and the time the tax is collected the loss is sustained by the government. In the Philippines it amounted to a net loss to the government of over \$1,000,000 within less than a year's time, in the depreciation of the coins they received in the payment of taxes.

Mr. MANN. If it will not interrupt the gentleman, may I ask him a question? I do not wish to break in on the gentleman's argument.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MANN. What do you mean by saying that there is a net loss to the Philippine government of \$1,000,000? They do not take in any less money, do they?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They do not.

Mr. MANN. They do not pay out any gold for silver, do they?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No.

Mr. MANN. They make no exchange?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No.

Mr. MANN. You mean that the money that they take in is worth a million dollars less?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Do they not pay salaries with this same money?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They do not as a rule.

Mr. MANN. What do they do with the money?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They deposit it at the bank.

Mr. MANN. What object is there in depositing this money at the bank? Why do they not pay it out?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, they deposit at a bank, and they do pay salaries on the official rate to provincial officers. They check against the account in the bank to pay salaries and expenses, and if they are paid in silver they are paid at the rate in force at the time of payment, which is much higher, as a rule, than the rate when the money was received.

Mr. MANN. Do you mean that all salaries are fixed on the gold basis?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. All salaries are fixed on the gold basis; but the government is required to use a great deal of money besides in payment of salaries, and in those uses the current value of silver is the basis, or, if the government insists on payment at the official rate, the difference is included in the price it is compelled to pay. The loss is the same, whichever way it is considered. The rate of exchange fixed by the government is not the current rate in private transactions.

Mr. MANN. That simply means loss after collection in depreciation of silver, and not really a loss of money. You say it is a million dollars. I do not see how it is possible to be a million dollars, but I have no doubt that you have authority for the statement.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have that information from J. H. Barrett, assistant insular treasurer. He gives the exact loss on account of the depreciations as \$1,304,568.96.

Mr. MANN. What is the amount of the collection?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not have that, but I think it is seven or eight million dollars altogether.

Mr. MANN. That would be one-seventh, notwithstanding they have made nine—I think the gentleman said nine—different changes in the ratio in about a year of time.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman must bear in mind the important fact that a great deal of the money was on hand in the form of deposits received at our rate of exchange and paid out at a much higher rate. The government has coined balances amounting to six or eight million pesos, and had them on hand at the time rates were changed.

Mr. MANN. Did he state if it was put in the bank and held upon a gold basis?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, no; it was not on a gold basis in the bank always. Banks keep two kinds of accounts—gold and silver. All accounts were kept in silver until the insular government required gold accounts also.

Mr. MANN. If not deposited on a gold basis, there could be no loss on a gold basis.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the situation of affairs, and it is stated by the officers there that there is a loss. A depositor who has a silver account in a bank must lose with the decline of the value of silver. It is somebody's loss, whether it is the customer's or the bankers' is not so material. That is a proposition of ethics that is not involved in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MANN. The difficulty with me upon this point has been that whether the Philippine government would not do better by paying the salaries on a silver basis rather than undertaking to maintain a gold basis for salaries and a silver basis for other use.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. All the government operations are conducted on a gold basis.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think a portion of the salaries are paid on a gold basis. Where Filipinos are employed they are paid upon a silver basis, and the Americans employed are paid upon a gold basis.

Mr. HILL. School-teachers, Army officers, and clerks are all paid in American money, and always have been; but insular officials are paid in insular money.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me suggest the method of business. All the officers of the insular government proper are paid in gold, I think, but the provincial officers are paid in current money, upon the assumption that they are to be paid out of the provincial fund.

Mr. MANN. Upon a silver basis, you mean.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Upon a silver basis.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Can not this all be remedied by having your import duties made upon a gold basis, instead of changing the entire silver coin to a gold basis? And would there be any loss whatever if these import duties were imposed in gold there?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have given the situation there now.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why change the entire currency and the entire standard of value in the operations between individuals and the government when there is simply a shortage of revenue?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They have silver currency, and all dues to the government are payable in gold, and to subserve the convenience of the people the government fixes a ratio between gold and silver so that public dues can be paid in either currency.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It would all have to be paid ultimately in products.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is refining the question beyond the point which it is required to go in this discussion.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not think so.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the opinion among business men and all who have thought upon the question is universal that the currency of the islands ought to be put upon the gold standard. The silver standard operates unjustly and disastrously. It is maintained by England in the Straits Settlement and in the Federated Malay States, because English people do the banking there and conduct a large commerce with people in silver countries. Men who are possessed of knowledge and experience are able to protect themselves, but the poor and the helpless are always at the mercy of the capable and the wise. The losses from fluctuations in currency are finally visited upon the ignorant and the helpless in all countries.

I quote from Professor Jenks's report in relation to the operation of the silver standard in East Sumatra, a Dutch colony, and he says the same condition exists in the Straits Settlements and the Federated Malay States. He says:

There is probably no reason to doubt that under the somewhat peculiar circumstances of this colony of the East Coast the silver currency is, for the present at any rate, decidedly beneficial, not merely to the planters, but also to the productive and mercantile classes in general, while it would probably be difficult to show that the Chinaman, the laborer, is seriously, if at all, injured by his use of this coin, although it is he chiefly who bears the burden.

Even, however, if it could be shown that the silver standard was maintained at his expense, it is still an open question as to whether the country should endeavor to enlighten the Chinaman, with the certainty that it would be deprived of a considerable part of his services if it were to undertake the task of enlightenment. It should be borne in mind that he is not a citizen; he is an exploiter in a small way who comes to take back to China with him most of his earnings.

That explains the attitude of Great Britain in maintaining the silver standard in many of her oriental colonies. Mining and agriculture are conducted there on a large scale, and almost all the labor is performed by Chinese coolies.

They go there under contract; they are accustomed to the use of the large silver dollar; they know what it means in Chinese trade and Chinese civilization; and Professor Jenks, in his report, says the coolies are so ignorant of the operation of economic law, that notwithstanding the depreciation—the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar—they do not know where to locate the difficulty, and therefore the planters and the mine owners continue to employ them at a fixed price and to pay them with the constantly depreciating dollar, greatly increasing their profits by the operation.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Is it possible that the gentleman from Indiana offers that statement as a justification for stabilizing the silver currency of the Philippines and exploiting it at the expense of the working people of the islands?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I offer the statement to illustrate the hardship that the silver standard works upon the laboring people in the Orient. Is it not a correct application of an economic truth? Is it not an injustice to the ignorant coolies to be paid year after year in a depreciated coin at the same nominal rate? Do they not carry chiefly the burden of this very imperfect and most unsatisfactory system of coinage?

Mr. HILL. That is all true. And now the proposition in the bill of the majority is to stabilize that system. Does the gentleman advocate that? Is that what we are in the Philippine Islands for?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The proposition of the majority is not to stabilize such a system at all, but to supersede this fluctuating, depreciating currency with a dollar or peso that will be worth as much next year as it is this year; that will be worth as much when the money is paid as it is when the price is agreed upon.

Mr. HILL. I admit that it is proposed to stabilize; but to stabilize what? To stabilize a condition reached after seventeen years of depreciation of silver.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman is in accord with me respecting results, but we differ about methods. We are both for a coinage system that will benefit the people of the Philippine Islands and will especially protect the ignorant and helpless who are now the prey of the bankers, the money changers, and the merchants, the men who with a lead pencil write the prices of their commodities without consulting the interests of their patrons.

That is the situation now, and I do not know as it makes much difference where we stabilize the currency so we make its value permanent. The bill of the majority stabilizes the currency at the point where, by tradition and custom, the people of the archipelago associated it, so they will understand more readily its relation to commodities and the fixed standard of value than if we seek to double the traditional value.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Did my colleague understand and say that the incorporation of American money in the Philippine Islands will accomplish that result? Did not the gentleman vote for the Porto Rico and the Hawaiian currency bill? Eighty per cent of the people in the Hawaiian Islands are of the very class of those of the Philippines now.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the extension of the American currency might ultimately—I do not say it is a hopeless proposition—accomplish that result; but how long would it take? It occurs to me, from what I know of conditions down there, that the pathway to that eventuality is a rugged, rocky one, beset with a great many dangers and dire possibilities that this Government is not now prepared to encounter. It is true that we extended the American currency to the island of Porto Rico; but everybody who has investigated conditions there knows that it did disturb, that it did dislocate, local conditions. It could not help it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I must deny that proposition.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is impossible to materially change the standard of value in any country without creating business disturbances, and in many instances working great hardship. That condition was created in Porto Rico by the change, but the difficulty would be multiplied many times in the Philippines, judging from the testimony of men who know and who are best calculated to give judgment on the question, and the situation there just now will not bear much more in the way of discord and friction.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman think that the conditions would be worse by a change of this kind in the Philippine Islands than they were in Porto Rico? Is he not aware that shortly after Porto Rico was taken we introduced the American money, and that for five years the American money has been circulating in every nook and corner of the Philippine Islands until to-day there is more American money in the Philippine Islands than there is of any other kind of currency, and that this money is going there to-day at the rate of \$2,000,000 a month, right out of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I know there is a large amount of American money in the Philippine Islands, principally in the city of Manila; it is in the treasury of the Government or in the vaults of the banks. But there is no American money in the interior among the people who do business on a small scale.

Mr. HILL. Do not the officers at every Army post, the soldiers at every encampment scattered all over the archipelago, receive their pay in American money?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is true enough; and that American money finds its way back to the banks. I am talking about the condition of the 6,000,000 natives outside of Manila. If we were legislating for the benefit of American officers, American soldiers, and American school-teachers there, I would believe with the gentleman from Connecticut that it would be the proper and intelligent thing to extend the American currency to the archipelago. But we are legislating for another class of people—a class of people who for generations have been transacting business with the Mexican dollars, with the Spanish pesos and pesetas and centavos, and all that sort of thing. That coinage is woven into the fabric of their business and their civilization.

Custom is infinitely stronger in the Philippine Islands than it is in this country. It is the observation of Professor Jenks that the Chinaman, who possesses fully as high a standard of intelligence and business acumen as the native Filipino insists upon receiving payment of his wages in the large round silver dollars year after year. He will not take anything else; and though they are constantly depreciating, he has not sufficient knowledge of the operation of economic law to know where to locate the difficulty.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman allow me to cite just a single fact in opposition to his suggestion that the Chinaman does not know what he is taking? Last year in China, at Pekin, I could exchange one dollar for eleven 10-cent pieces, the difference being simply the variation between subsidiary coinage and the full legal tender; and the "poor Chinaman," who is supposed to be so ignorant that he does not know the difference, had calculated that variation exactly, so that he would give to any comer eleven 10-cent pieces for a dollar merely on account of the fineness of the coin.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not pretend to say that Chinamen are all ignorant and inexperienced, for they are not. There are many able, shrewd, capable business men in the great Empire of China and in all the marts of the Orient. But the difficulty with the gentleman from Connecticut is that he associated with none but intelligent business men; he did not go down into the provinces and pueblos back in the archipelago and come in contact with the native Filipino in his real home condition.

The gentleman did not associate with the Chinese coolie, who has no appreciation of economic law. It is true that Chinese business men are among the shrewdest business men on the face of the earth; it is likewise true that they go into Singapore and the Straits Settlements, and the Federated Malay States and impose these miserable dollars upon their ignorant countrymen who sweat and toil. British bankers say this is a wise policy. The spirit of Machiavellianism, a wise policy, indeed! They are not our citizens and it is not our business to educate and enlighten them as to the value of money; so they will go on receiving cheaper and cheaper coin, while the profits of the employer continue to grow larger and larger.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is it not a fact—I ask for information—that in the city of Manila to-day you pass American silver at its parity value? Is it not true that the American silver dollar will be received in the city of Manila at virtually twice, and at the present time a little more than twice, the value of the Mexican silver dollar?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then what disturbance to business would result if we simply made more American silver dollars to go out gradually farther and farther into the country there?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have been laboring for some time to demonstrate the reason why it should not be done. If we had only to legislate for the city of Manila we might extend American currency there without inflicting much hardship, because the people of Manila are fairly well informed in regard to the relative value of the several kinds of money. But by many times the larger portion of the inhabitants of the islands do not live in the city of Manila. They do not have the intelligence, they do not have the experience necessary for their own protection. They are slaves of tradition, custom, and superstition; and their whims and caprices are a factor in the successful operation of any money system.

It would be an egregious mistake to impose our system upon such a people. We must take into consideration the whole situation—the rinderpest, which destroyed the carabao and brought on a rice famine, the cholera, the locusts, the fact that the archipelago has recently been devastated by a dreadful war, and the consequent demoralization. If we add to the already aggravated situation may we not reasonably expect insurrection, and possibly revolution? Is it the time now, let me ask gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, from a political standpoint, to further aggravate a situation that is already bad?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes more to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman this question, Whether the conditions in the Philippine Islands to-day are worse than they were in Porto Rico after the hurricane, when the island was practically destroyed, and it was about that time that we introduced the American money there. I supposed our genial friend, the delegate—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not want to be discourteous to the gentleman, but I have only ten minutes more time and there are a number of questions which I desire to discuss.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. HILL. I would state, Mr. Chairman, that I have asked the delegate from Porto Rico if he would change back and he said he would not.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, briefly, in answering that question I want to say that the conditions in the Philippine Islands to-day are infinitely worse than they ever were in the island of Porto Rico. There is no comparison. The sentiment of discontent, the disposition to ascribe to the American Government in the archipelago the responsibility for the distresses of the people, are such now that conditions are really serious and they will not bear any more aggravation. They are infinitely worse than they ever were in the island of Porto Rico.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana rose.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleague, I must decline to yield. I have but little time and have several propositions to consider.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. In the face of the testimony which was

submitted to the committee which reported this bill, and in view of the character of the argument which was adduced by the various witnesses before the committee, I believe there is but one intelligent course for this country to pursue, and that is to establish the Conant system of currency, fixing the peso at 50 cents in gold and stabilizing it on that basis, so that business men and bankers and toilers may know, when they receive a peso, exactly what it is worth—so stabilize it that it will be worth as much next year as it is to-day, so that all can depend upon it. I would like to go further into that question, but I do not have the time.

The pending bill provides that the standard unit of value shall be the gold dollar. It has been suggested that the standard unit ought to be a fictitious peso, equal to one-half the gold dollar. If we were making a permanent system of currency for the archipelago and were going into the business of coining gold pesos, making the silver peso exchangeable for the gold peso, there would be force in the suggestion that the gold peso be made the standard unit of value, but no one pretends that either this Government or the government of the Philippine Islands shall coin any gold pesos.

If there is to be redemption or interchangeability, the redemption shall be by the American gold dollar and the interchangeability shall be with the American gold dollar. Therefore every consideration of logic and practicability suggests that the standard unit of value should be the American gold dollar. Redemption is to be in the American gold dollar and exchangeability shall be with the American gold dollar, and that ought to be a standard unit of value.

Now, the question about the ability of the archipelago to maintain the parity I have not time to go into at length, though I would like to do so. It does present, in my judgment, a question that is somewhat serious, but with a limitation upon the volume, and the power which is conferred upon the insular government to employ the usual safeguards, including the issuing of temporary certificates of indebtedness for the maintenance of a redemption fund, it is the judgment of men who are qualified to speak upon that question that there will be no difficulty on the part of the insular government in maintaining the parity of the coins.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him one question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Was not the bone of contention between the House and the Senate last session the absolute, unalterable position taken by the Senate that they could not do just what you are proposing to do?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes, I understand that the Senate took the position that the Philippine government could not maintain the parity and the House took the other position, and the Senate, I understand, is converted to the position of the House, because a bill has been introduced and reported by the Philippine Committee of the Senate establishing the Conant system, substantially, as we provide for it here. They have changed base upon that question.

Now, in relation to the danger of authorizing an unlimited issue, that danger is always present in a fiat currency. It has been the temptation of governments in all times to abuse the power, to yield to the pressure to create fiat money when it can be done by simply printing and issuing; but I hope the American people have had sufficient experience so that they are able to safely handle that question, and I make the assertion that the insular government of the Philippine Islands, where the discretion is lodged by this bill, is safer upon that proposition than the United States Government itself.

Mr. HILL. I have thought that to be true.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Safer than the Federal Government, because the insular government consists of the Philippine Commission, appointed by the President of the United States. They are in a position where they will not yield to a temporary frenzy in time of great depression for more money and cheaper money, where political clamor can not influence them, and their safety and conservatism are free from assault. They are free from conditions that move the Congress of the United States, a body which is very liable to reflect in its work the weaknesses as well as the virtues of popular opinion.

In times of great pressure and great distress in the country, in times of monetary panic, there is always a demand for more money and cheaper money, and if a Republican President had been elected in 1893 and the panic had come on the country as it did come, I have many times wondered if in 1896 Democracy, under the banner of free silver, would not have swept into power, and that abominable heresy have been inflicted upon the country. Who can tell?

I am not surprised, Mr. Chairman, that my friends on the other side of the Hall oppose the system that is proposed by the committee. I would not have been surprised at all, if the committee had proposed the bill that the minority report, the

minority had insisted upon the Conant plan. I presume that is the legitimate function of the opposition party.

I would not charge gentlemen in control of the minority measure with attempting to play politics with the situation—they never do that; but if the American system of currency as it exists here should be extended to the Philippines and should create further distress and disturbance who can tell what effect it might have upon the next Presidential election, how great a factor it might be, how effectively the argument might be used that the Administration lacked the ability to preserve and maintain peace and tranquillity in the islands after it has been once established there?

There is another proposition I want to refer to before I conclude, and that is involved in section 6 of this bill. An attempt was made to amend section 6 so as to preserve the rights of creditors in the discharge of debts that were contracted under the existing currency, to pay them off in that currency at its face value. On an analysis of that section I am satisfied that the committee did exactly what it did not intend to do.

If this bill shall pass, debts that have been contracted in the past and that are payable in Mexican coin and Spanish pesos today would be payable in the legal-tender money of the country at the time of payment, and this would add at least 25 per cent to every existing obligation. It was the intention of the committee to make provision so that debtors who now owe money might discharge their obligations in the currency in which the debts were contracted. And at the proper time I shall submit an amendment to that section which I think will accomplish what the committee desire to do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I shall use all the time that has been allotted to me, as there are several gentlemen who desire to speak on this side. In fact, I had not intended to take any part in this discussion until I listened to some of the arguments advanced by gentlemen on the other side in support of the measure offered by the majority.

But when I observed from the closing remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that he had taken occasion to appeal to political considerations to secure the passage of this bill, it was evident to me that they were not willing to risk the passage of the bill upon its merits alone. It seemed to me, in listening to the chairman of the committee that the most of his argument, as well as the arguments of those distinguished gentlemen from which he quoted so extensively, were directed more against the financial situation in the Philippine Islands than in support of any particular measure for the relief of those conditions.

We admit that legislation of some kind is necessary. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I knew just how far we had proceeded along the route of incorporating the Philippine Islands into the United States as a part of the United States I might be better prepared to discuss this question. But I want to say that so long as the American Government continues to hold on to those islands as a part of the United States I believe that we should govern them the same as any other Territory of the United States, and I am not prepared to say that even the passage of this substitute offered by the minority is necessary to make American money a legal tender in the Philippine Islands.

There is no question but what there is a great deal of American money in the islands to-day. The report of the Schurman Commission, the evidence taken before the Committee on Insular Affairs, as well as the statements of the distinguished gentlemen who have visited those islands, all show that there is now a large volume of American money in circulation in those islands. Now, what will be the result if you pass the bill offered by the majority? In connection with that large volume of American money you will have another currency, entirely different, namely, that provided by this measure.

They will have the American dollar in the Philippine Islands and the Filipino peso, almost the same size, but with only half the value. One is to be exchanged for a hundred cents in gold and the other for 50 cents, and both issued by authority of the same Government. It will necessarily lead to confusion, a great deal more than if there were but one system of coinage for the islands. So long as we retain those islands, so long as they are occupied by the American Government, and I may say by the American people, a large amount of American money will be in circulation there, and I believe it will be better, not only for the Americans there, but natives as well, that they should have but one system of currency. A double system can but lead to confusion.

If there is anything that a person of but little intelligence and without any education learns more rapidly and more easily than anything else in this world it is the value of money, and it will only take them a short time to acquire this knowledge. If we

are ever going to introduce American money into those islands, can you select a better time than now for that purpose? You admit they have a bad financial system. Why not supplant it with a better one? The bill offered by the majority is but an experiment at best. If you adopt it how long do you expect to continue it; one year, five years, or ten years? And if you do will you ever be in any better condition to introduce American money than now? It is said our money is more valuable and laboring men will refuse to work for a reasonable price.

There will never be a time in the history of those islands when there is more reason for an advance, and a great advance, in the rate of wages than at the present time. The amount of American capital going into those islands for their development will necessarily more than double—yes, more than treble—the demand for labor, and wages ought to increase. There is no better time for wages to increase in those islands, and therefore no better time to introduce money of a higher value than at the present time and under present conditions.

It is said that the laborer will refuse to take the American 50-cent piece as readily as the Filipino coin twice the size, though their value be the same. When he learns that an American coin half the size of a Filipino coin will buy just as many of the necessities of life he will no longer hesitate to accept the American money at its full value. But the chairman of the committee says the merchant will endeavor to keep up the price of his goods and sell them higher on account of the introduction of American money. Will not the competition between the merchants in those islands regulate that matter there the same as it does at other places, and will it not be a very short time until the prices of the goods sold there will adjust themselves to the new American money, and when the laboring man sees that he can get just as many of the necessities of life for 25 cents in American money as he could for 50 cents of the other money he will readily accept it.

Here is another suggestion I want to make, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that this Government, when establishing a currency system in those islands differing from that in Porto Rico, differing from that in other territories of the United States, is discriminating against those people, and it will not help the establishment of friendly relations between the United States and the Filipinos. I should think their pride would be to be treated as nearly as possible the same as other citizens of the United States and that they would want the same kind of money as we have in other parts of the United States. I believe it would have a tendency to increase our trade there, and it certainly will not hinder it.

Here is another suggestion I want to make. Gentlemen on the other side took the position that those people were not capable of self-government. By the passage of this bill one of the greatest functions of a government is imposed upon them, that of maintaining parity between an unlimited amount of silver coin and gold coin. It is true it is limited, but only by the discretion of the Commission itself; and while it is a great Commission, while we all recognize that Judge Taft and his colleagues on that Commission are men of distinguished ability, I do not believe that Commission or any other commission is as capable of legislating and establishing a coinage system for the people of the Philippine Islands or any other people as the American Congress. I think here is where that question ought to be settled.

Now, what do you do by this bill? You provide that in order for them to maintain their parity, the Commission, officers who are foreign to that people, not a part of those people, shall have the power to issue gold certificates of indebtedness to the amount of \$5,000,000. You can not have more than five millions in circulation at one time, but you can issue five millions every year, because these bonds are made payable in three months, and not more than one year. And at what rate of interest? At such reasonable rate as the Commission may fix. The Commission can issue them at any rate of interest which it considers reasonable.

Suppose this bill passes and we should have designing men in those islands, as we had in the United States a few years ago, who wanted to force the Philippine Government to issue five millions of gold certificates, could they not do so and produce the same endless chain for forcing the issue of gold bonds in the Philippine Islands that we had in the United States? Will you contend that that people, whom you claim are entirely incapable of self-government, and weak in finances, are able to take care of a condition as serious as the one we had in our own country a few years ago while trying to secure gold to maintain the parity of our two metals?

But that is not all. When this \$5,000,000 is issued, the power of the Philippine Commission to maintain the parity is exhausted. How are you going to pay off that indebtedness? There is no provision made, and while it is outstanding no further indebtedness for this purpose can be created. Suppose under such conditions the two metals part company, suppose the parity disappears, what remedy have you then? None. I say it is a mistake. I care not

how sound this bill may be in other respects, it is a mistake to place upon the people in those islands, in their present weak condition, the burden of maintaining the parity between the two metals as provided for in this bill. I think the safer plan is to extend to those people our own monetary system, as provided in the substitute offered by the minority.

Now, gentlemen talk about stabilizing the currency over there, and the word "stabilizing" seems to be rather fascinating to those on that side of the House—"stabilizing the currency." How do you stabilize it? By your bill you simply put it all in the discretion of the Philippine Commission. That is all. And, as was said by my colleague, you would have about as much legislation if you would simply pass a bill of a few lines authorizing the Philippine Commission to take charge of this whole question. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 1193. An act to correct the military record of Henry M. Holmes; and

H. R. 16021. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 149) to provide for holding terms of court in the district of Utah, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HOAR, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RAWLINS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 53.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination to be made of the Columbia River, in the State of Washington, between Wenatchee and Kettle Falls, with a view to removing obstructions to navigation, and to submit plans and estimates of cost therefor.

PHILIPPINE COINAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has fifty-five minutes.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I yield twenty-five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to convert you to the gold standard. In 1861 the Philippines had a gold standard with a mint of their own. In 1876 the Mexican dollar, the cheaper money, drove out the gold and took possession of the country, but it has taken possession of it on a gold basis. Gold has always measured silver there on the basis of 16 to 1.

Now comes the proposition to substitute another standard, 32 to 1. We have had various authorities quoted to us why this should be done. The chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs has given us what he calls many authorities. I give him the authority of the United States Senate, who say in as emphatic words as Governor Taft said, that it would be disastrous to the Philippine Islands to change the standard. They said so in their official report made to the United States last June. And now he comes in here with a proposition that proposes to change the standard from 16 to 1 to 32 to 1. It is not a proposition to adopt the gold standard in the Philippine Islands; it is a proposition to adopt the silver standard in the Philippine Islands on a basis of 32 to 1, saying to my silver friends from Colorado, "You shall never advance silver in this country beyond 32 to 1," and saying to the gold-standard friends, "We will try and hold it up by a reserve fund to 32 to 1." That is what this bill proposes to do; not to adopt a gold standard at all.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the committee, cites Japan among other cases. I want the members of the House to compare in their minds the difference between Japan and the gold standard at 32 to 1 and the Philippine Islands and a silver standard of 32 to 1. There is this difference: Japan, when she started in on the gold standard, had seventy-eight millions of full legal-tender silver, and what did she do with it? The first thing was to sell forty millions of it as bullion and recoin the other thirty-eight millions into subsidiary coin, and they have to-day a gold basis.

Look at the difference. The committee brings in a 32 to 1 standard, and what do they propose to do? Deliberately inject

seventy-five millions, according to the Senate, and an unlimited amount, according to the House, of full legal-tender silver into the currency system to begin with—the very thing Japan disposed of before she went on a gold basis at all. The two conditions are radically opposite. The Senate bill proposes an imaginary unit of 12.9 grains. This bill does not propose any gold whatever. The entire system of coinage will be silver and nothing else. There is the difference between the two.

Gentlemen cite India. The difference is just as marked in India as in Japan. Why, sir, does any sane man believe that if India were starting a new system of coinage she would start in with several hundred millions of silver rupees? Not at all. The people of India found themselves in that condition, and they are doing the best they can. This is a proposition to begin over again, not to make the best of existing conditions. And it is proposed to drive out everything in the way of coinage over there and start anew; start where we are, in the United States, only 50 per cent worse. Would we to-day inaugurate a new coinage system in the United States with 600,000,000 legal-tender silver dollars? Not by any manner of means. Yet that is the proposition.

Gentlemen say that India is maintaining parity. It is true. But she is maintaining parity by exchangeability, and there is not a thing in this bill which says anything about exchangeability. India is paying out gold for silver and silver for gold. It is a very sad fact that India was able to do this last year by reason of the circumstance that six and a half millions of gold came in from the poor peasants who, on account of the famine and other hardships of life, were obliged to surrender their personal ornaments and turn them into the treasury of India.

Look at the difference. India has \$1.58 per capita of silver. We have \$8. The Senate bill starts off with the proposition to supply that little desolated archipelago over there with \$75,000,000—\$12.50 per capita—and the House bill makes no limit whatever; it leaves the matter entirely discretionary with the insular government—not with Governor Taft, but with the men who will succeed him after he has gone upon the Supreme Bench or become President of the United States. That is the difference. It is to be left entirely with them to coin all they please.

Next, Mr. Conant is quoted. I know Mr. Conant. He is an able man; and he is cited here as authority for this new patent hybrid currency system proposed to be started over in the Philippines. I want to ask the chairman of the committee for what has Mr. Conant received such great distinction in this and other countries? For a History of Banking—a magnificent work. He is an able gentleman. In that work he has gone into the banking system as existing in every country of the world. He submitted to this committee a banking system for the Philippine Islands, every word of which has been discarded from the bill and rejected. If gentlemen thought so highly of his currency system, why did they not think well of his banking system? But every word of the latter was rejected.

We have been referred to the Netherlands as an illustration of silver being maintained at par. It is true; but it is the coinage of the Netherlands in Europe that is being maintained at a parity, just as ours would be if we should adopt this minority proposition and introduce our coinage over there. There is no special silver coinage in the Netherlands; and all of the coinage of the Netherlands is maintained at parity to-day by a provision in their laws that if at any time the Government of the Netherlands should deem it wise, they may withdraw a large part of its silver coinage and melt it down into bullion, without waiting for the approval of their legislative authority. So, when the Netherlands are cited as a justification of this proposition, it is simply an argument in favor of the bill presented by the minority here.

Now, the chairman of this committee ought to be fair. He has presented here a paper which he and other gentlemen have received recently from the Philippine Islands, called the Cable News, and he has read a number of statements as to the desirability of this new system of coinage. He read a word or two from Mr. William H. Anderson, of the Pacific Oriental Trading Company, one of the largest importing houses in the islands, having agencies at Hongkong, India, and various seaport towns.

Let me read what the gentleman did not read from the expressions of this same gentleman:

The next house visited was the Pacific Oriental Trading Company, one of the largest importing houses in the islands, having agencies at Hongkong, Hilo, Cebu, Tacloban, and other seaport towns. Mr. William H. Anderson, general manager of the company, said to the Cablenews representative:

"The currency of the Philippines is in awful shape. Commerce has been given a blow from which it will not recover soon. When the currency of a country is affected, the commerce, the life of any country, the mainstay of any nation, is also affected. Without commerce there can be no prosperity.

"Manila is rapidly coming in contact with the markets of the world, and the commerce of the Philippines had been making rapid strides until the depreciation of Mexican money began. Since that time commerce has retrogressed woefully. However bad the effect of the recent silver fluctuations have been upon the business community, Manila has not yet lost her standing with the other markets. Being, as we are, in contact with the other markets, our currency should be the same as theirs—gold. I do not believe

in the Conant dollar as a medium of exchange. Many claim that the American money will not be accepted by the natives. Why, the first thing a people learn—I don't care where they live or what kind of people they are—the first thing they learn from foreigners is their money. It is nonsense to say that the natives will not accept the American dime in place of a peseta."

Why, sir, an American nickel goes for gold anywhere in the world. A Japanese ricksha man, a Chinese cooly, will take an American nickel for gold anywhere. There are a dozen gentlemen on this floor who know that what I am saying is true, for they have had the knowledge of personal experience. I cite as one of these a gentleman immediately before me [Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania].

Mr. Conant says the same thing in his testimony; yet gentlemen come in here and say that these natives in the Philippine Islands will not accept American money. Why, sir, only last week I called upon a colonel of the American Army, whom I met out there in the Philippines. He has been there two years. I said to him, "Give me your judgment as to what kind of currency would be acceptable in the Philippine Islands. Will those people take American money?" He said, "Yes." "Why," said I, "the natives would not know that an American 10-cent piece was equal to a 20-centavo piece of Philippine coinage." "Do you think so?" said he. "Why, sir, away up in the northern end of Luzon, away up in the woods, those people coming into my quarters would ask me to sell American coin at a premium over and above the rate fixed by the Commission. Why? Because, as they said, when they got American money, they knew where to find it, and when they had their own money, it was sometimes here and sometimes there."

And they were ready to pay a premium of 12 per cent, or 272 cents, for a dollar instead of \$2.60, the rate fixed by the commission in order to get American money, and that is what they are doing to-day; and I shall go into that subject in a moment as to the facilities which they have for doing it.

Mr. Anderson adds:

It is nonsense to say that the native will not accept the American dime in place of a peseta. Of course you may go back into the interior, employ a native to do a certain thing, and he will naturally prefer to be paid in Mexican, simply because he is accustomed to that currency. Now, suppose I owed a native a peseta and I laid down a peseta and a 10-cent piece, side by side. He would pick up the peseta, of course; but if I refused to pay him in Mexican, and gave him the 10-cent piece, what would be the result? He would finger the dime suspiciously and grumble. However, when he went to a store, presented his 10-cent piece, and asked for that much rice, he would receive a peseta's worth. His education would then be complete. He would realize, through this simple object lesson, that American money is worth twice as much as the Mexican and would be satisfied with the former.

Aside from the losses which we sustain from the use of the peso there are other objections to it. It is the most cumbersome coin in existence. It can not be transported with the ease with which currency should be taken from one place to another. Frequently our losses from its use can be attributed solely to its cumbersome nature. For instance, a man sends in an order from the provinces, and we ship the goods on the next steamer. (Here is another obstacle in our way, but I will not dwell upon it. I mean transportation, or rather the lack of it.) It may be a month before the goods arrive, and, owing to the scarcity of paper money in the provinces, the merchant can not remit for his goods, even if he wants to do so, immediately. He must wait until some friend can carry the money for him, or he must make a special trip to pay for the goods, which is often impossible. The result is we wait from two to three months for the money. In the meantime the price of silver has fallen, and when the money finally arrives we find that we have sold the goods for about the amount they cost us plus the transportation and other expenses incurred in getting them here.

WE LOSE, IT MATTERS NOT IN WHAT COIN WE DEAL.

We have now put our business on a gold basis, but before this we lost heavily on such transactions. And now that we have begun doing business in gold our trade is falling off on account of the advanced prices which we quote in Mexican at the Government rate. We lose both ways. If prices are in Mexican we lose on exchange, and if our prices are in gold we lose in trade. So it is apparent that we lose, no matter in what coin we deal.

What we want is a stable currency, and it is absolutely necessary that we have it. Everybody is a victim of the present currency system. As I said before, I am not in favor of the Conant dollar, but its adoption would greatly relieve the situation, because it will be stable.

How was it in Porto Rico? I wish that our good friend, the Delegate from Porto Rico, was permitted to stand upon this floor and tell the experience of the people of Porto Rico with regard to their change of currency. I have here a letter, which I have not time to read, from Governor Hunt, of Porto Rico, in which he states that while there was trouble for about thirty days, owing to conditions down there, that the change was a wise one, and substantially saying that if he had it to do he would do it over again. I want to have one letter read, showing in a very few words the result of the change of the currency system from the irredeemable currency of Porto Rico to American money, and I will send it to the desk and ask to have it read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN COLONIAL BANK OF PORTO RICO,
San Juan, August 15, 1901.

CHARLES A. CONANT, Esq.,
Special Commissioner to Philippine Islands, Manila.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 25th July came duly to hand. The change in currency in this island was made easily and comparatively quickly, and did not result in hardship to the people to any great extent. At first the smaller merchants were disposed to ask dollars in place of pesos for their wares, but competition in business soon stopped that. Wages have risen slightly, but

not as a result of the change of moneys, the cause being purely the result of better conditions and greater profits among the agricultural classes, save with the coffee growers. With them the destruction of crops, and in many cases of whole plantations, by the hurricane of 1899, has cheapened the price of labor. We do not think that harm resulted to anyone, save temporarily in a few cases, through change of money, and it has removed the fluctuation of value in the money of the country. American currency was at a premium most of the time, and values changed as much as 2 per cent in a single day. There is no more of that, much to our relief, and the people here appreciate the change from their cheap money to one that passes current the world over. We trust the same plans may be carried out in all of "Uncle Sam's" new dominions, as it does a good deal toward Americanizing the people of the country.

Truly, yours,

E. L. ARNOLD, Cashier.

Mr. HILL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to have read also the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America.

The Clerk read as follows:

And if in addition United States currency shall follow the flag, the time is not far distant when the prices current of all Asia will be written in United States money. Porto Rico suffered temporarily by a changed standard, but it took no longer to learn the purchasing power of the different denominations of United States money than it would to have learned a new system. Surely the world has as many kinds of money as it needs, but it has none so convenient as United States money. Let United States money be made as secure as the British pound, and its employment in the commerce of the world will become as universal as the use of the English language. They are both the natural servants of commerce.

Mr. HILL. I ask permission to insert in the RECORD the expression of opinion on this bill by a gentleman whose superiority on a question of coinage and currency over any other citizen of the United States will not be doubted by anybody in the country. I refer to Mr. Horace White, of New York. He declares as his opinion that this is simply a silver-purchasing bill. That opinion is as follows:

THE PHILIPPINE CURRENCY BILL.

Just before the holiday adjournment of Congress Senator LODGE reported from the Committee on the Philippines a bill (S. 6357) to regulate the currency of the islands. It provides, first, that the gold peso, equal to a half-dollar of our money, shall be the unit of value, but does not provide for any gold coinage. Instead of that, it makes the gold coins of the United States legal tender in the Philippines at the rate of \$1 for 2 pesos. Next, it provides for a silver peso of full legal tender, to be coined from bullion bought by the Government, and of which the Government must coin twenty millions, and may coin seventy-five millions. Thirdly, it provides for subsidiary silver coins to be legal tender for \$10.

The effect of this measure is to establish in the Philippines what is called the "limping standard," a phrase applied to countries which have the gold standard nominally, but also have a large amount of silver of full legal tender. Germany, France, and the countries of the Latin Union are in this category. The United States is in the same category. None of the countries named consider the condition a happy one. The European nations took the limping standard because they could not help themselves. They caught it as people catch the measles. They had large amounts of silver in circulation in the early seventies, when the gold standard swept over the civilized world, and they could not get rid of it. Germany made great efforts to sell hers, and did dispose of a part of it. In doing so she broke the price of the metal, so that when the Latin Union countries decided to stop coining silver they had no market on which to sell theirs. The United States is the only country which took this kind of measles voluntarily. We took it with our politics, but no political party is very proud of it now. Nor shall we have any reason to be proud of it, after our experience with it and our knowledge of it in other lands, we inflict it upon a people who are under our legislative control.

The great objection to the limping standard is its uncertainty. Those who are under its régime never know where they may stand a year hence. A bill is now pending in Congress to remove the uncertainty which the limping standard entails—a bill to provide for the redemption of the silver dollar in gold. The act of March 14, 1900, recognized the uncertainty by a clause requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to keep the silver dollar at par with the gold dollar, but did not provide him any means to do so. Senate bill 6357 recognizes the same uncertainty attaching to this system in the Philippines, by authorizing the government of the islands to adopt such measures as it may deem proper to maintain parity between the gold and silver coins and to borrow \$10,000,000 gold for that purpose. This clause of the bill expresses the fear of its framers that the equilibrium of the standard will not be maintained without extraneous and extraordinary efforts.

Looking at the details of the bill, it is very doubtful whether parity can be maintained if the government of the Philippines exercises all the powers conferred upon it. It must coin 20,000,000 and it may coin 75,000,000 silver pesos of full legal tender, at the ratio of 32 to 1, while the market ratio of silver to gold is 43 to 1. The line of prudence and safety under the limping standard lies in keeping the amount of the overvalued money (the silver pesos) no greater than the retail trade of the country can absorb, but the temptation will be ever present to overpass the limit. We know how this is ourselves. Unless the Philippine government is wiser than the Washington Government was we may expect to see the limit overpassed as it was under the Sherman Act.

In devising a new monetary system for the Philippines the simplest plan is the best. The gold standard, as provided in the bill before us, with a silver subsidiary coinage of the kind provided in the act passed by Congress last year, is quite sufficient. There is no good reason for thrusting in a third kind of money whose sole virtue will consist in its redemption in gold. These pesos would be both an element of danger and a needless expense. As the bill provides for issuing paper certificates for them like our silver certificates, why not issue the certificates in the first instance? The pesos are to circulate on the credit of the government, not on their intrinsic value. Our silver certificates would circulate just as well, perhaps better, if there was not a dollar of silver behind them. If the Filipinos prefer to handle silver rather than paper, give them plenty of half pesos, which the bill also provides for. The natives probably know that two halves are equal to a whole one.

As the pesos are quite unnecessary, the only visible object of coining them is to make a market for silver bullion. We trust that the Senate committee is not now trying to "do something for silver" at the expense of the Filipinos, but we recall the fact that the Senate bill of the last session did have that aim, since it contained a clause that the coins might be made at our mint, but that the silver bullion so coined should be of American production.

We are told by some people that if we introduce the single gold standard we shall increase the wages of labor in the islands. That depends upon the

ratio between gold and silver which may be taken as a starting point. Wages in the Philippines, although nominally the same as of old, have been actually reduced by the decline in the value of silver. The laborer, who gets a peso in wages, can not buy so much with it as, before. As regards future wages, the question is, what shall the future peso be? The bill says it shall be an amount of gold equal to half of an American dollar. That is the ratio of 32 to 1. It is a fair starting point, since it was the market ratio when we took the islands. It was the ratio actually adopted by Japan in the same year. There has been a fresh drop in silver within a few weeks, which has cut the effective wages of labor still lower. The Filipino laborer has been thrown down by the force of circumstances, and Congress ought not to hold him down, but rather to lift him up and put him on his feet, especially since Congress neglected its duty in this particular last summer, when it might have avoided the major part of this trouble.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I will submit a letter on this question from Governor William H. Taft, just received from the Philippine Islands, which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MANILA, P. I., November 25, 1902.

Hon. E. J. HILL, M. C., Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HILL: I thank you very much for your letter of the 15th of August. The monetary condition here is now dreadful. Exercising the authority which the Philippine act gave me, I have fixed the official ratio as 1 to 2.60; in other words, the Mexican dollar has lost in gold value in less than one year 30 per cent. This has inflicted a great deal of hardship upon the wage-earners, whose salaries do not change with the change in value of silver, while that which they buy and have to live on does change and follows the market for silver.

Mr. HILL. Just one moment there, Mr. Chairman. I want the members of this House to listen to that sentence. Eighteen years ago the Philippine Islands were on a gold basis, and wages paid accordingly. You can take the testimony of these commissions—the Schurman, the Taft—all of these commissions right straight through, and it will show you that while prices have advanced as silver has decreased, wages have been practically stationary, and these poor people there have been robbed by this depreciation in silver. Now, then, what does this bill propose to do? Where it started, sixteen or eighteen years ago, dollar for dollar and has gone down to one-fifty, two hundred, two-fifty, two seventy-two, this bill proposes, by power of governmental action, to take silver from two seventy-two and lift it up to two hundred and hold it there, and when it proposes that, it proposes to hold the wages of these poor people—never over 10 cents a day in any money—right there at two for one, and “if you do not do it, gentlemen,” they say, “it means revolution!” I never yet heard of a people who started a revolution against their own increase in wages. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does the gentleman not know that since the American occupation of the Philippine Islands the wages of laboring men have doubled, nominally, in the coin of the country and in some instances trebled?

Mr. HILL. I know they have in Manila.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would like to know what the gentleman means by saying that they have remained stationary.

Mr. HILL. They have in Manila, and I am glad of it. But they are only now paid 10 cents in gold.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me ask what the gentleman meant by stating to this committee that the wages had remained stationary during all these periods and that it was the purpose of the committee—

Mr. HILL. I said that was the purport of the testimony through every commission. I have read every word of it from beginning to end, and it shows that the effect of this fall in silver has come from the pockets, from the sweat and blood, of the poor working people of these islands, and I have very little doubt that that had as much to do with the Philippine insurrection as any other one thing. I say that as Republicans, anyhow, it does not lie in our mouths to say that we will refuse to pass a currency bill which will help in wages the laborer, increasing his pay from 10 cents a day upward. [Applause.] That is my doctrine.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend allow me?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. This bill provides or attempts to provide, first, that the unit shall rest upon the United States gold dollar.

Mr. HILL. Well, this bill does. The Senate bill does not.

Mr. CANNON. Second, that 2 pesos shall be a legal tender, within certain limitations, for a dollar.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And that the peso is to have a weight of 416 grains.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. That the money shall be maintained at a parity by redemption.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. In gold.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Now, that gives the 2 pesos double the weight of our half dollar, and more.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And puts the burden upon the insular government to maintain the parity.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Now, so much for the bill. I would be glad to know what the gentleman would put in its place?

Mr. HILL. I would put American money in every possession of the American Government anywhere. Whenever we take them, I would let American money go with the American flag.

Mr. CANNON. That is to say, the gentleman would put the gold dollar there as the unit, and it would put the half dollar there not weighing half as much as the peso, and he would maintain that at a parity, would he not?

Mr. HILL. Oh, certainly.

Mr. CANNON. How much easier is it to maintain a half dollar at a parity with gold, when the half dollar does not weigh half as much and is not worth half as much intrinsically as the peso?

Mr. HILL. I stated some time ago, before the gentleman came in, that if the United States were to start a new system of coinage to-day not even the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], with his antiquated notions in regard to money, would consent to have it start with 600,000,000 legal-tender silver dollars in our currency to-day. [Applause.] But this is a new proposition. This is to start off a new system of currency among a poor, ignorant people—amongst a low-down people, only half civilized.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me another question, because he switches—

Mr. HILL. Well, I am careful not to switch the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Under this bill the insular government maintains the money at a parity. Now, who maintains the United States half dollar, under the gentleman's scheme, at a parity with gold in the Philippines?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I will answer that question just as soon as we hear the rest of Governor Taft's letter, if you will hold it for a moment or two.

Mr. CANNON. I will hold it, but I should be glad to have an answer as to how that is to be maintained.

Mr. HILL. There is no trouble about that. I will come to that.

Mr. CANNON. I do not want declamation—

Mr. McCALL. But information.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Moreover, those who have permanent investments—and there are quite a number in Manila and the islands—the income from which is payable in silver, are suffering greatly. The depression in agriculture is very great; 90 per cent of the carabao have died, and they are almost indispensable in the cultivation of rice. Rice has gone from \$4 Mexican to \$7 a picul of 137½ pounds; and in many of the provinces, due to defective interisland transportation, it has reached \$12 a picul. We have had to buy 300,000 piculs with the hope of steadying the price, and we expect to distribute it through the provinces.

We are very much in need of legislation that shall put us on a gold basis. I do not insist on the Conant plan, though I think that the most feasible.

Mr. HILL. Listen to that, gentlemen. One moment. I want the members of the House to listen to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I yield fifteen minutes more to the gentleman from Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for fifteen minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. But I should like to hear what Governor Taft says.

Mr. HILL. I am learning by experience, following the example of our friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], never to allow the thread of one's argument to be broken until one gets ready to have it.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

Mr. HILL. I want it distinctly understood by the members of this House that we have been told to-day that the adoption of American money in the Philippine Islands will prove disastrous to them, and will even create a revolution; and yet Governor Taft says to me, over his own signature, that he does not “insist” on that proposition; that all he wants is legislation giving us the gold standard.

Now, I ask the Clerk to go on with the reading, please.

The Clerk read as follows:

But some relief must be given us, and that at this session of Congress. I sincerely hope, too, that Congress will be generous and will reduce the Dingley rates from 25 per cent reduction to 75 per cent, so that agriculture may receive encouragement here. Neither the sugar crop nor the tobacco crop will reach America in sufficient quantities to influence the market, but, on the other hand, it will greatly aid us. Anything you can do to help us in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

I am, with great respect, sincerely, yours,

WM. H. TAFT.

Mr. HILL. Now, Mr. Chairman, we were asked last night to give authorities, and we have tried to cite a few. I ask the

chairman why he does not quote his witness of six months ago—the Director of the Mint, Mr. Roberts, who appeared before the committee in favor of this proposition. He is now standing for American money only.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What does he know about the condition of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. HILL. He knew six months ago, when he was your witness. I saw that from the investigation. If you inquire you can not find an officer of the Treasury Department of the United States, from the Secretary, the Treasurer of the United States, to the assistant treasurer of the United States, who is not to-day in favor of the introduction of American money. Gentlemen, you have not got to introduce it; it is there.

Mr. CANNON. But if my friend will allow me, because he has the courage of his convictions—

Mr. HILL. I know just exactly what the gentleman wants me to say, and I am ready to say it—that the United States has got to maintain the parity over there, and he does not believe in doing that.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I admit it, and I admit that we have got to maintain the parity of our money anywhere in the world, wherever it goes, less freight and insurance in transferring the gold.

Mr. CANNON. We get at the exact point of difference between us.

Mr. HILL. I am not ready to discuss it, but by and by I will take it up if I have time.

Mr. CANNON. It goes to the very gist of the matter.

Mr. HILL. Now, Mr. Chairman, the question is whether this will be a greater change for American money than if we adopt this system. Last summer when this matter was under consideration I went to the Treasury Department and inquired as to the amount of American money that had been sent there, and I found that the Pay Department had sent \$24,000,000, the Quartermaster's Department sent \$3,000,000, the Commissary Department \$370,000, and was advised that other payments of the Pay Department would amount to \$12,000,000 in drafts; so there were forty millions of American money we had sent there. The other day I asked Mr. Meline, the assistant treasurer, how much they were sending over there now, and he said on an average \$2,000,000 a month was being sent there of American money.

Our friends of the Insular Committee recognized that situation last session and provided that American money should be a legal tender. But they have stricken that out now, leaving only gold as a legal tender there. So if you go on and adopt the provision in the insular bill you have got two tasks before you: First, to drive out the Mexican, and then to drive out the American money; and the last is not a good task for American representatives to be engaged in—to attempt to drive American money out of those islands. Whether we are going to keep them or not, and I think we are going to keep them, let us keep the American coin in circulation there, and it ought to be there to keep our trade in the same form of money. Talk about the peasants and natives not accepting American money! When I was there in Manila, I visited the Insular Cigar Manufactory, where they have 2,500 hands employed. The manager is an Englishman.

I asked him if a change to the coinage of the United States would be of advantage to him. He answered, "The trouble is, you didn't do it when you came here." He said, "You ought to have adopted American money immediately." He said, "The danger is in the delay in doing it." I asked him, "How do you pay your employees?" He said, "In anything; American dollars, Singapore dollars, Bombay dollars, Mexican dollars, anything I may happen to have, on the going ratio, and they take it just the same, according to the going ratio." They understand it, and they will understand it. The quickest thing one learns is to count in a foreign language and to reckon foreign money.

This is one of the tasks before you. Now, gentlemen, this bill is to establish the silver system in the Philippine Islands, to stabilize the present rate of wages. That is what it means. My friend from Illinois wanted to ask me a question. Although my throat is very sore, I will endeavor to answer it if I can. Now, providing we have American money there, who is going to maintain the parity? Who is going to maintain the parity of this money?

Mr. CANNON. The insular revenues of the insular government. The silver half dollar contains over twice as much silver as the American.

Mr. HILL. Certainly; but who maintains the parity of the American dollar in the Philippine Islands? Answer me that.

Mr. CANNON. The American dollar in the Philippine Islands—

Mr. HILL. Who maintains the parity?

Mr. CANNON. It maintains itself.

Mr. HILL. That is what it will do if you make this change. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Does my friend—

Mr. HILL. I will tell you how it will affect the gold coin. If your government which you have started—our government, pardon me—which we have started over there is able to maintain the parity under the terms of this bill, who is going to furnish the gold for commercial transactions under the terms of the bill which the gentleman has reported?

Mr. CANNON. Who furnishes it under your system?

Mr. HILL. The banks.

Mr. CANNON. The bank?

Mr. HILL. The bill provides that the government shall do it under your bill, and the very losses which are occurring now from the shrinkage of silver, which losses occur to the man who has got the Mexican dollar in his pocket, will be saddled on the government under the terms of your bill, and they have got the balance of trade against them all the time, and they can't do it, and the Senate told you so last June.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me right there. The Government of the United States, my friend will admit, practically maintains the parity of money. All the forces operating responsible for government, added to a full legal tender, and great blocks of it redeemable specifically in gold. My friend will admit that in the last analysis the Government here maintains silver that is intrinsically worth less than 40 cents at a parity with gold. We would have to-day the same thing there. He says whereas that burden under a wise administration ought to be borne by the insular government, in my judgment—

Mr. HILL. Now, gentlemen, if you have a full legal tender of American gold with a subsidiary coinage in the Philippine Islands. I would not be here opposing this bill. Why? Because it would be just like Canada. Her system is gold with a full legal tender and silver for subsidiary, and bank notes for commercial transactions. A man when he wants the gold goes to a bank, pays the rate of discount, and gets the gold. It is just the same in Hawaii. They had the gold and a full legal tender and a subsidiary coin for small money and bank money between the two. But these people have come in and injected a new feature, put a burden on this little weak government that has not yet started. Instead of giving it milk, they are putting upon it a full legal tender of silver.

Now the gentleman said, "Who is going to maintain the parity of the American money if we put it over there?" I will tell you how it will work. Suppose there was nothing but American money there and I wanted to pay a bill in New York. I would go to the bank and pay 1½ per cent premium and get the gold in American money. That is the way they did in Hawaii. They had to pay a premium of 1 per cent in gold. Why should they pay it? Because if I did not get it, I could take the American money, send it to San Francisco, and have the gold come back, and the cost would be the expense of the shipment and the interest while the transaction was going on. But under your system what do you get? Simply this: You have got seventy-five millions of legal-tender money, and it is all the money you have got; you have no gold-coinage system under this bill. But you want gold and you have got to have it in order to transact business. How are you going to get it? Gather up legal-tender silver and go to the Treasury and say you want gold for it. "But," they reply, "we can not give you gold for this." Where, then, is your parity? Do you suppose that legal-tender silver would be worth two dollars for one if you could not give one for two? I do not think so.

Now, then, suppose the government did the same thing which the bank does; and without violating any confidence, let me say that I had a conversation with Mr. Conant the other day as to the modus operandi of this measure. I asked him how we are going to maintain exchangeability. He said: "The government will charge exchange the same as a bank does." In other words, you propose to start out with that half-civilized people over there and put them in the banking business to begin with.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will not the banks have the same facilities under the Conant system as they have under the system you advocate?

Mr. HILL. Certainly; but do you suppose that anybody wanting \$10,000 in gold would go to the bank and pay 1½ per cent exchange for it when they could go to the treasury of the Philippine Islands and get it for nothing? [Laughter.]

Consequently you transfer the whole burden of supplying the gold for the foreign business of the Philippine Islands from the banks and from the commercial transactions to the government. Your government is not strong enough for that.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Would there be any exchange on gold with an adequate gold reserve in the treasury?

Mr. HILL. Certainly there would, because you have not a clause or a line or a syllable in this bill which proposes to make it obligatory on the government to pay gold. The matter is simply optional as you have fixed this bill. In the original Conant bill

you had a provision, which you have stricken out, that American money should be exchangeable and should be legal tender all the way down. But you have stricken out all that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman—

Mr. HILL. Oh, there is no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I wish simply to say that he is not stating the exact facts; that is all.

Mr. HILL. I am willing to be corrected.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The original Conant bill never contained any different provision with reference to redemption or exchangeability from that contained in the pending bill, which was drawn by Mr. Conant; at least, drawn when he was present.

Mr. HILL. There is nothing anywhere in this bill that requires exchangeability on the part of the government. Let me read the provision of the bill. We who are in the habit of discussing measures of this kind expect to have them drawn carefully. To-day, in the Banking and Currency Committee, I have had put upon a bill as an amendment a little proposition which I do not think anybody at the start considered for the moment to be essential; yet upon careful examination it was found to be vital. Let us see what provision there is in this bill for maintaining the parity of this money:

That the coinage authorized by this act shall be subject to the conditions and limitations of the provisions of the act of July 1, 1902.

I have looked that act through and through, and there is no provision there except as to the denominations of the coins. There were such provisions in the original Conant Act; but the act of July 1, 1902, was a compromise between the House and the Senate. I think it was intended to refer back to the act of July 1, 1902, as it was before the conference committee got to work upon it; but when the bill left the hands of the conference committee certain provisions which some gentlemen now seem to think are in that bill were stricken out:

That the coinage authorized by this act shall be subject to the conditions and limitations of the provisions of the act of July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," except as herein otherwise provided; and the government of said islands may adopt such measures as it may deem proper, not inconsistent with said act of July 1, 1902, to maintain the value of said peso at the rate of 2 pesos for \$1 of the gold coins of the United States.

That is all the restriction there is; there is not anything else—"such measures as it may deem proper." They may exchange if they want to, and they need not exchange at all if they do not want to. What is the value of this silver coin under such circumstances?

And in order to maintain such parity between said Philippine pesos and the gold coins of the United States may issue temporary certificates of indebtedness, bearing interest at a reasonable rate, payable at periods of three months or more, but not later than one year from the date of issue, which shall be in the denominations of \$50, or 100 pesos, or some multiple of such sum, and shall be redeemable in gold coin of the United States or in lawful money of said islands, according to the terms of issue prescribed by the government of said islands.

How are they to be paid? We have been through one experience of that kind—one experience of trying to get gold to maintain the redemption of the greenback—and the United States to-day has \$262,000,000 of bonds unpaid as the result of that experience.

Mr. Chairman, without detaining the committee further, I will say what else I may wish to add under the five-minute rule.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. How much is there remaining to the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty minutes.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I should like the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs—of course he desires that his side shall close the debate—to state how many speakers he has in reserve, whether one speaker is to occupy the whole of the thirty minutes, or whether it is to be divided.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think that one speaker will occupy the whole time.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, to all legislation on the subject of money and finance is difficult and in its application to conditions is shrouded in some degree of intricacy, uncertainty, and doubt. This may in some measure be attributed to our efforts to follow the specialist and the theorist, who has a pride for his own remedy for the financial ills that may from time to time confront us. It may come in part from the uncertain sea of industrial operation on which proposed new legislation is to embark. Difficulties are made still more perplexing by forces operating to promote legislation. One trouble comes by reason of the distance of our insular possessions and the difficulty of ascertaining and determining the real conditions, but the most danger-

ous and the most potent is the force looking to its own special interests. I stated on the floor but a few days ago on the consideration of the Hawaiian coinage bill that I favored American money in all the United States and in all the territory subject to its jurisdiction.

The measure proposed by the minority of the committee for Philippine relief is not an untried expedient; it is not an experiment. In it is found our legislation for Porto Rico. Under the Porto Rico financial act, passed in the face of predictions of disturbance and disaster to that island, prosperity came to all interests, and universal satisfaction prevails. This is not problematic or unproven. It is found in the history of Porto Rico since we sent our system of money there.

The statement of my colleague on the Insular Committee [Mr. CRUMPACKER], that the act resulted in disorders of a substantial nature, should not go unchallenged. It did not. My authority for this is the best, none other than the statement of Porto Rico's chosen representative, who now sits in this House.

We have the precedent of Porto Rico and of Hawaii to follow to justify our action in placing American money in American territory. What is there to make the Philippines exceptional? Do number of inhabitants change a principle of government? Porto Rico has a million people, and in force they are equal to several millions in the Philippines. Is it exceptional in the Philippines because of her oriental population? You find in Hawaii, in round numbers, 124,000, or four-fifths of her population, are Chinese, Japanese, and Hawaiians, the latter not as alert as the native Filipino, and yet American coinage was given by the legislation of this House only a few days ago to that oriental population.

The minority present in their substitute a safe and sure highway for insular financial legislation and do not venture on the new and untried pathway of exploration and exploitation as does the measure presented by the majority of the Insular Committee. Your measure changes their financial system; you have precedents for making it American; then why use this as a stepping-stone when it involves two changes instead of one, involves a departure from Americanism and a fleeing from American money?

This change of money in the Philippines proposed by the other side involves all the troubles, and no others, that would come from carrying American coin to the islands and is an unsafe and unwise departure from our policy of financial legislation.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the ten minutes that remain to our side to the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] a moment ago, receiving permission to interrupt the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], asked a question, to which he received a reply; and afterwards I understood him to say that the advisability of this entire legislation turned upon the point which he had made by asking the question. He asked, "Who is going to maintain the parity out in the Philippine Islands?" and expressed the opinion that the insular government ought to do it. Now, if it be true—and he generally does know the salient point of a case—that this is the salient point of this case, we might just as well wrestle it out here.

Now, the Democratic substitute, or rather the minority substitute, offered here to-day—because this ought not to be a party question—does not change conditions so far as the volume of silver money is concerned, nor does the majority bill offered here make any change in that respect. So that what is left is this: Who shall maintain the parity of existing silver money? There will be no silver money in the Philippine Islands the parity of which is to be maintained except the silver money which we as the Congress of the United States have placed or shall place there, and it is just as absurd to say that the government of the Philippine Islands shall be held responsible for maintaining the parity of silver which we shall place there as it would be to say that the government of New Mexico should be held responsible to maintain the parity of American coins there.

In further answer to the gentleman's question I would like to ask another: Who now maintains the parity of existing American silver coin? There will be nothing outside of existing American coins, except a few recoined pesos which will take the place of the pesos authorized to be coined in the Philippine Islands under the act of January, 1902, by the Congress of the United States. Why, Mr. Chairman, there will be no expense attending the operation. The parity of our coins is maintained automatically. The parity of the American silver dollar is maintained in Manila now.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] admitted on the floor to-day that at this time our silver dollar passes in the purchase of commodities and in payment of services upon the streets of Manila for two dollars and some odd cents worth of Mexican dollars; that it passes there now at its gold-parity value, whereas the Mexican dollar passes at its bullion value. I want to ask the

gentleman another question. Who maintains to-day the parity of the American silver dollar in London and in Paris and all around the world? Does the gentleman mean to tell me that the great Congress of a great Republic ought to authorize a coinage of any sort and still leave it to some little outlying dependency, some petty crown colony, and some subdued appendage, some subject appendage to maintain its value and our good faith with the nations and with the commerce of the world? Is that the salient point in this case, Mr. Chairman? If it is, it seems to me that the gentleman's argument rests upon very poor legs.

Not only that; I said a moment ago that that parity was now maintained everywhere, and that there is nothing either in the minority bill or in the majority bill so far as volume of silver goes to change existing conditions in that respect.

There is something, however, which threatens the maintenance of the parity of the Filipino silver coin which would be authorized to be issued under this majority bill if it shall pass here, because it would not be a United States silver coin, but nominally as well as actually a purely Filipino coin.

This morning the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] said that wherever you had a limited coinage of silver, at the same time receivable for public dues and private debts, that the parity maintained itself. That is not true without conditions to the statement. It is true wherever you have a great Government like this, with an immense, gigantic commerce behind it, it is not the stamp printed upon the coin that gives it its value, but it is the demand for the coin back of the fiat, a demand changed, perhaps created, by the fiat. When a great government that collects countless millions of money every year in public dues, receives it for public dues, and when a great people who export and import immense amounts settle their private debts in the coin, and thereby make that demand for the coin, too, it is easy with a limited coinage, even at a very high token value above its bullion value, to maintain it. But that is altogether a different thing from saying that a little country like Mexico or Venezuela or the Philippine Archipelago, with very small receipts of public dues and a limited commerce, could do the same thing. As a matter of fact Mexico has tried it and has failed; and not Mexico alone, but a dozen little republics and kingdoms upon the surface of this earth.

So that there is danger under the gentleman's bill to the maintenance of the parity in the Philippine Islands, dependent as it is upon the Philippine government and Philippine commerce. There would be no more danger to the maintenance of the parity of American silver dollars in the Philippine Islands upon the passage of the minority bill than there would be to the maintenance of the parity of American silver dollars in New Mexico or in Arizona or in any other Territory of the United States.

Gentlemen of the Republican side, I wish you would think about this measure before you pass it. This measure has not been well considered. It has been long considered, much testimony has been heard, but the fundamental principles involved in it have been but little considered. This transcends in importance a mere coinage measure, even.

In my opinion it violates a fundamental principle. The coinage of money is the exercise of a Federal function. Are you, then, going to leave it to a Territory—aye, worse, a Territory from a Democratic standpoint, but a crown colony, a mere appendage from your standpoint? Are you going to leave the exercise of a great function, considered so National and so Federal by the framers of the Constitution that they denied it even to a State, to this nondescript? This bill is wrong fundamentally; it is also wrong as a matter of policy and expediency, and let me come to that just for a moment. I have already told you why I thought it was wrong on the financial ground—that the parity of silver issued under it and by the orders of the American Congress might possibly be endangered. But it is wrong as a mere expediency from another standpoint. It is always foolish to take two bites at a cherry if you know beforehand that you are going to eat the whole cherry. There is no particular sense in taking two bites at a quinine pill if you know you are going to swallow the whole pill.

Gentlemen tell us that this is a temporary measure, and that we will gradually approach the American coinage system and gradually put it into operation—that this is a sort of bridge bill. If that is true, then in God's name if it is a bridge bill, between the present state of coinage conditions and banking conditions in the Philippine Islands and those existing in the balance of the United States, why not make the bridge long enough to cover the chasm and be done with it?

Get rid of the Philippines the first chance, but while a part of the common domain, every principle of constitutional law, expediency, and equity demand that they shall have the benefit of uniform laws and equality of conditions in industry, commerce, and finance.

Gentlemen in their testimony before the committee here told

you that it is easier and will cause less dislocation of business to substitute a "flat" 50-cent peso, as they call it, for the same peso worth in bullion value 36 cents; that is easier to do than it is to substitute a 100-cent American dollar. If that were true, is this easier first, to make a difference of 14 cents and afterwards make up the balance of the difference between your original 36 and your 100, taking two bites at two different times, causing two local disturbances and dislocations of business—is that easier than to do the whole business at once? There is not a man upon this floor who believes—I challenge a member of the majority to say so—that this is intended as a permanent bill for the Philippine Islands. All the testimony before the committee, all the conversations of members of the committee, the nature of the bill itself, everything goes to show, and they admit it, too, that it is intended for a temporary measure, a bridge, so to speak. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has thirty minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi said that all the testimony before the Committee on Insular Affairs shows that this is a mere temporary, makeshift measure. That is about as accurate as many other statements which have been made in opposition to the pending bill. Mr. Peabody, in his testimony before the committee, said in answer to this question from Judge CRUMPACKER:

Your idea is that this system proposed by this bill establishes a permanent system in the Philippines?

A. Yes, sir.

Nothing has been said to the contrary. I simply said in reply to a question put to me in the debate that I did not know, but that I thought the system would stay there for many years. I was not prepared to say that it would not, as changing conditions might necessitate new legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] was equally inaccurate, and even more positive in his inaccuracy. He said that this was a hybrid—"a hybrid, a new and patent system of coinage." I am amazed that a gentleman with all his learning and undoubted business knowledge should apparently be so ignorant of the facts.

I do not say that he is ignorant. I simply think that he forgot. It is not "new," "patent," nor "hybrid." Secretary Gage, in note "F" to the Secretary of War's report of 1900, indorsing the plan proposed in this bill, says:

Pay them out for all goods bought or service rendered, at the ratio of 2 silver pesos to \$1 of gold, and redeem them from the holder at the same ratio, namely, \$1 of gold for 2 silver pesos (or Filipino dollars).

The evident cure—

For the financial troubles in the Philippines—

is to establish their domestic money in a fixed relation to the world's money, or what might be better called the settling-house standard, London or New York. Can this be done? Probably it can. How? By following in a modified way what is now in vogue in the United States.

The "patent" system, to which the gentleman from Connecticut was referring in contemptuous terms, is, says Secretary Gage, the system "now in vogue in the United States."

Mr. HILL. I did not know that we had a system of 32 to 1 coinage.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But that does not meet the point I am making at all, and nobody is aware of that fact better than is the gentleman from Connecticut. The principle is not changed whether you stabilize the ratio at 32 to 1 or 16 to 1.

For many years Java has had this "new, patent, hybrid system." India has this "new, patent, hybrid system." It is not an untried experiment. It is a system long successful in the Orient.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut says that this bill does not propose that there shall be any gold in circulation, as if that fact were a subject for reproach. Professor Jenks, who has just returned from the Netherlands and India and the Straits Settlements, says, page 30:

It is perfectly possible in Oriental dependencies to maintain a fixed rate of exchange between gold and silver without the necessity of bringing gold, to any great extent, into circulation.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] objects to this bill because, as he says, people in the Philippines would ask the government for gold; it might be refused, and then "what would become of your parity?" Now, the Bank of France will not pay gold on demand in exchange for other kinds of money except at its own pleasure.

It pays it or not in its discretion, which discretion it has always exercised. And yet does anyone pretend that there is not a parity between all kinds of money in France? The limitation of a coinage, together with the fact that it is responsible for public debt

and all debts public and private, and the consequent demand for it keeps it at par with gold.

The gentleman says that it is the great demand in France and other countries for silver which keeps it at a parity. Let us see what would be the demand for silver in the Philippine Islands? They have there to-day approximately 40,000,000 pesos valued at \$20,000,000 in gold. We propose to give them instead 40,000,000 of other pesos valued at \$20,000,000 in gold. Now, the revenues of the islands aggregate from ten to twelve millions of dollars in gold or twenty to twenty-four millions of pesos a year, so that 1 peso in every 2 passes through the custom-house or into the tax coffers of the government annually.

That demand of itself, together with the limitation in the coinage, is sufficient to stabilize this proposed ratio. So says Hollander, who was in Porto Rico when they made the change of standards in that island; so says Governor Taft; so says Mr. Conant; so says Roberts, the Director of the Mint; so say all of the witnesses who have appeared before the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] says that the proposition in this bill is to "stabilize a silver standard," and he asks, with a great deal of apparent force, "Do you propose to put that sort of a standard on this helpless people?" Now, what a complete perversion of terms, what a mistake, to put it mildly, the gentleman from Connecticut did make in that question. It embodies a fallacy which must be apparent, on reflection, even to him.

Stabilize a silver standard! Who proposes to "stabilize a silver standard?" Nobody. We have to-day in the United States a silver dollar, coined only in limited quantities, the bullion value of which is 37 cents and face value \$1, and it circulates at par. Have we stabilized the silver standard here? No. Now, in the Philippines we propose to have a Filipino coin of silver worth 50 cents in gold, and to stabilize it with gold at that ratio.

Will that be "stabilizing the silver standard?" No; and it is a complete perversion of terms, a fallacy in reasoning, and a mistake in statement to assert the contrary. The gentleman was confused himself if he did not confuse anybody else. There is no attempt here, no proposition to stabilize the silver standard, and a financier like the gentleman from Connecticut, who so unsparingly ridicules the bill reported by the Insular Committee, should have known it.

The gentleman from Connecticut made another mistake and he received some applause for it. He said not a word is there in this bill about exchangeability. "They have stricken out the provision for exchangeability that was in the bill last spring." There was no provision in the bill of last spring making exchangeability compulsory.

Mr. HILL. But there was a provision in regard to exchangeability.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not a compulsory provision. There is to-day in the pending bill a provision which on this point embodies essentially the provision of the bill of last spring. Says the bill:

And the government of said islands may adopt such measures as it may deem proper, not inconsistent with said act of July 1, 1902, to maintain the value of said peso at the rate of 2 pesos for \$1 of the gold coins of the United States.

For purposes of exchangeability and to maintain the parity, the Government could, under that provision, in its discretion, exchange gold for silver or silver for gold, transfer-current fund, in the Treasury of the Government to the coinage reserve fund; issue temporary certificates of indebtedness, buy gold coin or bullion, or sell drafts on their deposits in the United States.

These provisions were all set forth in the bill of last spring, but the language of the pending bill is broad enough to include them without specific enumeration. This is the opinion also of Mr. Conant as expressed to me.

So there is nothing in that point, or alleged point, of the gentleman from Connecticut. We have taken out nothing. There is nothing to hide. I thought that the gentleman tried to convey the impression that we of the Insular Committee, who do not pretend to be experts in finance, but are simply trying to carry out a plan which we deem best for the islands and in accordance with the recommendation of the Philippine Commission—I thought the gentleman was seeking to convey the impression that we, without consulting Mr. Conant, had weakened the bill of last spring and erred in the measure we now offer to the House. The fact is that we took his judgment upon every single proposition in the bill. He has approved everything in it. It contains nothing which has not received his cordial indorsement. This disposes of another of the alleged points of the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the success of the experiment in Porto Rico. Now, there is a fallacy in that suggestion. An example or illustration is good in logic only

when the attendant or surrounding circumstances are the same. Porto Rico is one island. The community is homogeneous. Its extent is about 40 miles by 90 miles. It has a million of people, peaceable and quiet. The Philippine Archipelago comprises hundreds of islands.

It contains, as gentlemen know, more territory than the combined area of New York, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont, and is peopled by scores of different tribes, speaking scores of different dialects and tongues.

Back in the interior are millions of people little accustomed to modern business methods. Professor Hollander, a recognized authority upon taxation and finance, was in Porto Rico representing the United States Government when the change in monetary standards was made in that island. He was before the Committee on Insular Affairs, and I will read from his testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read you briefly what the Philippine Commission says upon this very point and see if it accords with your views:

"Limitation of the quantity operates in regard to coin as in regard to commodities—the value is raised by scarcity. Upon this method of giving value to silver reliance is chiefly placed in the countries of the Latin Union, in Holland, and in the United States. The limitation of the coinage of silver to the amounts previously existing and to the amounts fixed by the Government has given an artificial value to silver coin of all these countries, keeping them at par with gold."

Professor HOLLANDER. I am in entire agreement with that view.

The CHAIRMAN. So, then, you think the plan proposed is entirely feasible; that is, the establishing of the American gold dollar as the standard of value, with a silver coinage limited in quantity which shall be received for public dues, that the demand for it will keep it at par with gold, and that has been the experience of other countries mentioned in this report?

Professor HOLLANDER. That is my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you think in a country in such a disturbed condition recently as the Philippines, where the restoration of confidence in the executive and government is of prime importance, that it would be advisable at once to force the American coinage system?

Professor HOLLANDER. Unhesitatingly I should say no; it would be inadvisable.

The CHAIRMAN. That being the condition in the Philippines, then, you would be opposed to the immediate introduction of the American system of coinage in the Philippines?

Professor HOLLANDER. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] read an extract from the testimony given before the Insular Committee by Mr. Peabody, and Mr. Peabody was made to say that the introduction of the American system of money in these islands would not be attended with difficulty. I heard that examination, and I was expecting that somebody would bring it up, but I supposed that the rest of the testimony would be read before making that quotation, because in and of itself it is so grossly misleading. After Mr. Peabody had given the testimony which the gentleman from Georgia has read, this further testimony was given:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Peabody, in your reply to the questions of Judge CRUMPACKER, do I understand you to say that there would be no trouble, or hardly any trouble, about the immediate introduction of American money in the islands?

Mr. PEABODY. Not American money; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That was what Judge CRUMPACKER was asking you; and that is what he induced you to say.

Mr. PEABODY. I misunderstood his question, in that case. I intended my answer to refer to the new pesos.

A little farther in his testimony I find the following:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, to end this and get your exact opinion, do you think it would be wise for us to enact a law extending the American system of money to the Philippine Islands, either immediately or at some definite time in the future to be arbitrarily fixed now by statute?

Mr. PEABODY. I do not, sir. I think it is very important to continue a unit of money as nearly as possible that which they had always had in the form of silver.

Now, what becomes of the quotation read by the gentleman from Georgia, which in and of itself so completely perverted the meaning of the testimony of Mr. Peabody? Was that fair to the House; was it fair to the Insular Committee; was it fair to anybody who wishes to do what is right on the pending bill?

Mr. Chairman, I have it to-day from a man who knows, that a bill to establish the American system of coinage in the Philippines can not pass the Senate. Nobody knows it, Republicans of the House, better than do our political opponents on this floor.

They would be glad to be able to point with scorn at what we have failed to do for the poor people of that archipelago and to say: "Look at their pitiable financial condition; you have not given them a gold standard; you have not given them anything; you have only labored and brought forth nothing." That is exactly what will happen if the system proposed in the substitute bill be adopted by the House.

Mr. HILL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Just a moment.

Mr. HILL. I was going to ask the gentleman's reason for making that statement. Who are the men? Where are the people who shall say that when the House of Representatives votes for American money it shall not go? Where is the opposition coming from?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is coming from people who believe with Judge Taft when he declared that to establish the

American coinage system in these islands would produce only disaster, and who also believe that letter which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] had read to-day did not modify his testimony at all.

Mr. HILL. That does not answer my question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Just one moment.

Mr. HILL. If the House of Representatives voted for American money, who is going to say nay?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is out of order.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Gentlemen are going to oppose it in the Senate—

Mr. HILL. Ah, then, let them take the responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman's question. Mr. Chairman, the House last spring passed a bill containing coinage provisions and embodying essentially the provisions of the pending bill. That bill went to the Senate and the Senate would have nothing but free coinage.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And where was the gentleman from Connecticut then?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] did not, I believe, very seriously oppose that bill last spring.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. We all voted for it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not know whether he voted for it or not.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Just a moment, I want to finish. The Senate absolutely refused to have anything but free silver, and the House reluctantly decided, or its conferees did, that rather than have free silver we would have nothing in the way of new coinage for the Filipinos. So we retained the status quo. We have seen what has followed. Since that time the Senate has receded from its position; at least, the Committee on the Philippines has, to the extent of reporting a bill, as we all know, which embodies practically the principle of the bill now here pending.

Mr. HILL rose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Just a moment. Let me finish. Therefore, the Senate will not go back in this short session, with crowded Calendars in both Houses, reconsider entirely the whole proposition, and accept the American coinage system. I am sure, not only from what I know of human nature, but I have it to-day from a man in a position to speak with authority, that no such bill as the proposed substitute would be reported from that committee. Then why—

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman offer that as an argument for the passage of this bill, that we are to be held up?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not at all. There is no holding up about it.

Mr. HILL. If he does, I think it is time the House should assert itself.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not at all. It is simply a proposition to get some legislation for the Philippine Archipelago, to help those people out of the Slough of Despond in which they now are.

Mr. FOWLER. But you propose what is wrong.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. We do not propose to do what is wrong, we propose to do what we believe to be right, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER] who interrupted me sotto voce. We propose to do what the Philippine Commission, headed by the gentleman's great and good friend, as the gentleman himself calls him, William H. Taft, says would be right.

The letter which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] had read here does not at all modify the position which Governor Taft took upon this proposition in his testimony before our committee. The gentleman from Connecticut had it read to convey the impression that Governor Taft had receded from his former position. I read Governor Taft's testimony wherein he said—and this is his language:

In my opinion, to attempt to introduce the American system of coinage into the Philippine Archipelago would result in nothing short of disaster.

Has he modified that? Did the letter modify that? Not at all. The gentleman came very nearly misleading some members who spoke to me. What Governor Taft did say was:

I do not insist on the Conant plan, but I think it is feasible.

He is a wise, high-minded man, who knows the duties of an executive and the duties of a legislator. "Insist" is a strong word. He does not "insist" before the American House of Representatives that any plan which he favors shall be adopted. "Insist" is a strong word, and I infer that the gentleman from Connecticut wrote to him and asked him if he "insisted" on the plan.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has no right to make any such inference.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will ask the gentleman if he did not do that?

Mr. HILL. I sent to Governor Taft a copy of the amendments offered at the last session of Congress, providing for American coins, so that he might read it and fully understand it, and he replied that he does not insist upon the Conant proposition, but he thinks it would be the most feasible. That is all there is to it. He had it with the proposition for American coin squarely before him.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But did he indorse the plan? Not at all. He knew of the testimony of the gentleman from Connecticut before the Committee on Insular Affairs and therefore was well aware that the gentleman from Connecticut is a strenuous advocate of a system in which he, the governor, does not believe.

The governor adheres, in so far as his silence can be considered as adherence, to his testimony, which is that to attempt to establish that in those islands would result in nothing short of disaster. There is no modification of that statement. What consolation can the gentleman get from the epistle which he has had read here from Governor Taft?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The time for general debate has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the gold dollar of the United States, consisting of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, as defined by section 3511 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be the standard unit of value in the Philippine Islands; and the lawful money of the United States shall be legal tender in the Philippines for all debts, public and private: Provided, That for amounts under 100 pesos the silver currency of said islands authorized by this act shall, when demanded, be paid.

The following committee amendments were read:

In line 7 strike out the words "lawful money" and insert in lieu thereof the words "gold coins." In line 8, after the words "United States," insert "and the silver coins herein authorized."

In line 9, after the word "in," strike out the words "the Philippines" and insert "said islands."

In lines 10, 11, and 12 strike out all after the word "private."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am in favor of the proposition submitted by the minority for the use of American coin in the Philippine Islands and the extending of our coinage system to those islands. When the proper time comes I shall offer this amendment, which I am satisfied is necessary to the rounding out and completion of the substitute offered by the minority. This amendment I shall offer at the end of section 1 of the substitute:

And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized in his discretion to coin a half-cent coin of such form and with such devices as he may designate, and such half-cent coin shall be a legal tender up to the same amount as the 1-cent coin now authorized by law.

In other words, the proposition which I shall vote for and which I favor is the substitute bill offered by the minority, amended by adding to the coinage system of the United States, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, a half-cent coin.

Now, the gentleman has just stated that unless we adopt the proposition submitted by the majority members of the Insular Affairs Committee there will be no legislation at this session, and states that he is authorized or practically authorized to-day by somebody whom he does not mention to draw such a conclusion, if not to make such a plain statement. In the eight years that I have been a member of the House of Representatives I do not remember that any such threat has ever before been made to secure the passage of a bill upon the floor of this House, and it seems to me that it is our duty as members of the House of Representatives to vote our judgment upon this proposition, regardless of any action that may be taken anywhere else.

Now in regard to the feasibility of this proposition, we have done the same thing for Porto Rico, and we have voted to do the same thing in the Hawaiian Islands. It is simply a question as to the quickest way to give relief to those people in the Philippine Archipelago. Is it to authorize a new system of coinage, with new dies to be made, with new coins to be made, with a mint to be opened and started, and probably taking at least a year, or six months anyway, to get this new coinage into circulation, or shall we do as we did in the case of Porto Rico, send commissioners from the Treasury of the United States over there next week with an abundance of American money and take up their money, make the exchange, and we coin such as we see fit at our own option? Why, it seems to me that it is almost impossible to compute the advantage that would come to these people by our voting now to adopt American money and put it into use and operation over there, rather than to wait to establish a new system of coinage.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I move to strike out the last two words, Mr. Chairman.

One of two conditions, it seems to me, is bound to result if Congress pass the majority bill. Either the Philippine Islands

government must go into the banking business, providing a reserve in gold with which to redeem the silver pesos, or else it will have to maintain the parity of the silver peso with the gold by means of limiting the coinage of the pesos.

As to the first condition, it is plain that the difficulty is great, as the imports to the islands exceed the exports by over \$7,000,000 a year. This balance of trade, which is now paid mostly in silver, must then be met in gold, as by this legislation you overvalue the silver peso. All of that portion of the gold which will go to the Orient will be dropped into that bottomless well from which it is never rescued, as the experience of the past century has shown. Gold which goes into the interior of China never appears again in commerce. This reserve will become the storehouse for the supply of gold to the Orient on account of its proximity and the fact that the expense and risk of bringing it to the islands will be borne by the Philippine government. That the endless chain will be worked by those desiring gold in the Orient, through their agents in Manila, can not be doubted. Under such conditions, it seems to me, the effort to establish the parity between the peso and gold will be too expensive to maintain.

The only other way of maintaining the parity between the silver peso and gold will be by limiting the coinage of silver pesos, so as to make them dear and thereby increase their value above the bullion value of the same; in other words, by the substitution of a managed or fixed currency as against an automatic currency which responds to the demands of commerce.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that in either dilemma we will find the legislation detrimental—detrimental to the government if it maintains the gold reserve; detrimental to the people if the parity be established by limiting the currency sufficiently to raise the value of the peso above its bullion value. If you attempt to limit the number of silver pesos and in that manner elevate its value to gold, then you are not supplying a sufficient currency for the Philippine people, and that will be felt most seriously by the commerce of the islands. In other words, this bill substitutes for an automatic currency a proposition that the Commission shall determine how much money the people shall have. You say that five men appointed from the United States shall determine how much currency the Filipinos shall use.

Mr. Chairman, in that event it will result in this managed currency, which will not be adequate and will not be sufficient to supply the needs of commerce in the Philippine Islands, and consequently it will react upon the people and upon the industries of those islands. So either horn of the dilemma that we take, either position we assume, it seems to me in all likelihood will be detrimental to the business interests of the islands.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the substitute as against this proposition; but I do not believe that the substitute ought to pass. I believe the best thing to do is to let the system they have now alone, and not attempt to fix the ratio between the silver and the gold in these islands, because Mexico does not do it, Hongkong does not do it, the Straits Settlements does not do it, China does not do it, but they leave the settlement of balances in foreign trade upon the value of the metals in the open markets of the world, and they have no trouble in fixing the values and adjusting their balances in that manner. Why should we not do this in the Philippines? The very fact that the Commission has attempted to meddle with and fix the ratio there has been the cause of the difficulties in the islands. It has undervalued silver and then overvalued silver, and the result has been the exportation of silver or gold, depending upon the world's market value of the same, whereas if it had left their bullion value to be determined by the trade, we would have had the same condition as in Hongkong and Shanghai. Consequently my vote shall be in favor of the substitute as against this measure; and if the substitute is adopted for this measure then I shall cast my vote against it, because I think the existing condition is better than that which either one of these bills will produce.

The bad conditions in the Philippine Islands has not been caused by the silver standard, as other silver-standard countries would have been in the same condition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I showed this afternoon, the prosperity of Mexico, for instance, over what it was twenty or thirty years ago is almost unparalleled. Where we have doubled our exports in this country in the last thirty years, Mexico has quadrupled hers. While our banking deposits have increased largely in this country, the Mexican deposits have increased three times proportionately to ours. There is not a comparison that you can make upon any condition that existed in this country and that but what shows that the Mexican advance has been much greater than ours. Take the item of building railroads, for instance. It has increased in Mexico in the last thirty years three hundred fold, 30,000 per cent, while in ours it has only increased 100 per cent. Take the question of bank assets, and they have increased two hundred and seventy fold in Mexico, or 27,000 per cent. Take the silver deposits; they have increased one hundred fold, or 10,000 per cent.

Take their deposits in the last eight years; they have quadrupled. [Loud applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to a little incongruity between the arguments of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Indiana. This morning the gentleman from Wisconsin paid a very high tribute to the expertness and ingenuity of the Philippine people, because he said that if we had the American dollar out there, the bullion value of which was only about 36 or 40 cents, and coined it into a dollar which would pass for a hundred cents gold, that those people would counterfeit that dollar to an enormous extent. It follows from that one of two things is true. Either they have better machinery and better implements to counterfeit, or they are superior to our own people in their ingenuity and expertness in the counterfeiting business. That is a very high compliment to the ingenuity of these people.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will allow me, he misunderstood me. I did not say that the Filipinos would do the counterfeiting, but that the expert mechanics and jewelers of China and Japan would do it. So the witnesses said who appeared before our committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then the expert jewelers of China and Japan have either better implements for counterfeiting or are more expert and ingenious than Americans are—that is, those living in the Philippine Islands. It seems to me that that argument answers itself. The temptation is as great to counterfeit silver coin in the United States as it possibly could be in the Philippines after the passage of this bill, and yet the temptation to coin on the part of mechanics in the United States is as great and the opportunity greater. The temptation to make money even dishonestly or criminally with his remarkable mechanical ingenuity and his great greed for money will carry the average citizen of the incalculable American nation as far as the next.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Mississippi permit a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Granted that the temptation to counterfeit may be as great in the United States as in the Philippines, does not the gentleman know that the liability to detection is much less in the Philippines than in the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Why, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I ever heard that the liability of detection in a consular government with despotic power, where they have the right to enter houses, search the place, and do many things they would not have the right to do here, would be any less than on the continent of America.

Now, let me go ahead. A little while afterwards the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] assumed exactly the opposite position. He argued that these people in our oriental appurtenance were such intolerable fools that they could not learn the difference between the purchasing power of an American silver dollar and a Mexican silver dollar; that it was a great injustice to send the American silver dollar out there because the poor fools would cheat themselves all over the islands. I asked if our dollars did not already circulate in the city of Manila at double parity with the Mexican dollar, ours going at their gold parity and the Mexican at their bullion value. I asked for information and he gave me the desired information in the affirmative. Now, if it be true that the two coins are circulating in Manila side by side, and that these people have learned their respective values, it must be because the people have been brought face to face with them and know the value of each. Now, if some more money should be put out it will go farther and farther from Manila, and they will learn more and more and further and further their respective values. I take it that every military post in the Philippine Islands to-day has put out American silver and American gold. I have been informed by gentlemen in the Philippine Islands that it is the case.

But I want to go further with the argument of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] by reading some of the testimony before the committee. He said this morning that that state of affairs was confined to the city of Manila. The distinguished and astute and ingenious gentleman, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asked in the committee room this question of Mr. Peabody, the chosen great expert who is vaunted so much by the gentleman from Wisconsin:

Mr. CANNON. Is not the American dollar exchanged for two Mexican dollars right there now under their noses?

Mr. PEABODY. It would change to-day for—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The answer is "for more than two for one."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not now in order.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask, Mr. Chairman, unanimous consent for three minutes longer to finish reading this extract.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. TAWNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15520) to establish a standard of value and to provide a coinage system in the Philippine Islands, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bills of the following titles:

H. R. 15345. An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 622. An act granting a pension to Dickey Woodall.

SENATE RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

Senate concurrent resolution 56.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination to be made of the Columbia River, in the State of Washington, between Wenatchee and Kettle Falls, with a view to removing obstructions to navigation, and to submit plans and estimates of cost therefor.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 6216. An act to pay in part judgments rendered under an act of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Hawaii for property destroyed in suppressing the bubonic plague in said Territory in 1899 and 1900, and authorizing the Territory of Hawaii to issue bonds for the payment of the remaining claims.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 16970) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I reserve all points of order on the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury and the Acting Attorney-General, submitting a report relative to the condition of the Federal building at Syracuse, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting a revised estimate of appropriation for new building for Bureau of Engraving and Printing—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the secretary of the American National Red Cross, transmitting the annual report for the year 1902—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16023) to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States, reported

the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3305); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FOWLER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 395) requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to report to the House the names of all national banks which have held United States deposits, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3306); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TALBERT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16228) providing for the issue and circulation of national-bank notes, submitted the views of the minority, to accompany report (No. 3148, part 2); which said views were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12316) granting an increase of pension to Weden O'Neal, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3261); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1978) granting an increase of pension to Wesley S. Potter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3262); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4412) granting an increase of pension to John J. Rees, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3263); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5412) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Spring, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3264); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6543) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3265); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1131) granting an increase of Pension to Sydda B. Arnold, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3266); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3607) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Helton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3267); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4332) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Heddleson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3268); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5835) granting an increase of pension to Joel C. Shepherd, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3269); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5352) granting an increase of pension to William Flinn, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3270); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6071) granting an increase of pension to Mary Manes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3271); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6182) granting an increase of pension to Lila L. Egbert, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3272); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6257) granting an increase of pension to

Mary B. Keller, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3273); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6467) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Ropes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3274); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6514) granting an increase of pension to Stephen J. Houston, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3275); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6614) granting an increase of pension to Bertha R. Koops, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3276); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6693) granting a pension to Mary J. Ivey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3277); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1377) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Agnes Tridel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3278); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2812) to pension Susan Kent, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3279); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6127) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Catherine P. McLorinan, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3280); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHELDEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9237) granting a pension to John Wallace, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3281); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9814) granting an increase of pension to Mary Williams, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3282); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOREING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12771) granting a pension to William Kenney, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3283); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13358) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Wilder, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3284); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROMWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14254) granting a pension to Mary L. Purington, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3285); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14811) granting a pension to Amelia J. Robinson, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3286); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14845) granting a pension to Margaret Snyder, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3287); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOREING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14961) granting a pension to W. E. Sharp, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3288); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15363) granting an increase of pension to Grace G. Harrington, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3289); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15693) granting an increase of pension to Deletha Cook, reported the

same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3290); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15694) granting a pension to Bessie Ledyard, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3291); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOREING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15757) granting a pension to Frances C. Broggan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3292); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15841) granting an increase of pension to John Da Silva, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3293); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROMWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15735) granting an increase of pension to John H. Wheeler, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3294); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16153) granting a pension to George W. Choate, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3295); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16161) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Tradewell, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3296); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOREING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16217) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Jones, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3297); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16291) granting a pension to Laban McGahan, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3298); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16391) granting a pension to Ella F. Shandrew, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3299); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16564) granting an increase of pension to James Hunter, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3300); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16711) granting a pension to Ann Gilbert, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3301); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16313) granting an increase of pension to James L. Davenport, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3302); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOUTELL, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 948) for the relief of William Dugdale, postmaster at Noroton Heights, Conn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3303); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 13148, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 402) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the personal representatives of John McCabe and Patrick McCabe, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 3304); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16734) to provide an American register for the steamer *Beaumont*—Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

A bill (H. R. 16796) granting a pension to Jennie S. Miner—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 16941) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes," approved January, 1903—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 16942) to prevent robbing the mail, to provide a safer and easier method of sending money by mail, and to increase the postal revenues—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GROSVENOR (by request): A bill (H. R. 16943) to authorize the purchase of 1,000 copies of the History of the Live Stock Industry in the United States—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BLAKENEY: A bill (H. R. 16944) authorizing the Secretary of War to make a survey of Colgate Creek, in the State of Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 16945) to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 16946) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the coal-land laws to the district of Alaska," approved June 6, 1900—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: A bill (H. R. 16961) to continue the publication of the American Archives—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs: A bill (H. R. 16970) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16971) to increase the appropriation for a Federal post-office building at Marblehead, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RODEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) for the printing of 5,000 copies of the Report of the Governor of New Mexico to the Secretary of the Interior for the year 1902—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. RIXEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 255) asking for estimates for the improvement of Accotink Creek, in Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ACHESON: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 72) providing for the printing of 15,000 copies of Experimental Study of Children—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 73) for printing the statistics regarding the retirement of employees in the classified civil service of the Government—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A resolution (H. Res. 401) relating to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4386) to amend an act for the prevention of exterminating fur-bearing animals in Alaska—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 402) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 13148—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A resolution (H. Res. 403) to pay Harrison Edelin for services as janitor to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 16947) granting an increase of pension to Moses Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16948) granting an increase of pension to George R. Hanson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 16949) for the relief of George McDonald, administrator of the estate of E. McDonald—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 16950) for the relief of the State of Iowa—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 16951) granting an increase of pension to Harrison W. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 16952) granting an increase of pension to James H. Flanagan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: A bill (H. R. 16953) for the relief of the Bank of North Wilkesboro—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 16954) granting an increase of pension to Almena S. Willoughby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16955) granting an increase of pension to Nellie P. Coyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 16956) granting an increase of pension to John H. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 16957) granting permission to Capt. William E. Horton, United States Army, to accept a decoration tendered him by the President of the French Republic—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: A bill (H. R. 16958) granting a pension to Peter Welsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16959) granting a pension to Margaret Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16960) to correct the military record of Anthony Connolly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 16962) for the relief of the legal representatives of Charles W. Adams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 16963) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Dr. Thomas B. Waters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 16964) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Shook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 16965) granting an increase of pension to Abraham J. Yeomans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16966) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOMPKINS of New York: A bill (H. R. 16967) granting a pension to Anna P. Ewing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 16968) for the relief of the estate of Redding Woolard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16969) to correct the military record of Wiley W. Woolard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 16972) for the relief of Pain's Fireworks Company—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Allegheny County, Pa., for the passage of the immigration bill, also favoring the McCumber bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of L. T. St. John, of Mitchell, S. Dak., for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of South Dakota, in favor of House bill 173, for reduction of tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNELL: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nayang, Pa., to prohibit liquor selling in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolutions of the American Free Trade League, to place beef and coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Paint Grinders' Association of the United States, urging legislation to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish uniform freight classification and freights—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Petitions of Ambrose Johnson and others, of Rusk; Coswell-Preston Drug Company and others, of Beaumont, Tex., urging the passage of House bill for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Rev. R. J. Young, of Pittsburg, Pa., for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Papers to accompany House bill 13713, for increase of pension of Rebecca Randolph—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 16151, granting an increase of pension to Harmon P. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Charles Wood, suggesting that a monument be placed at the grave of the mother of George Washington, at Fredericksburg, Va.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BOWIE: Petition of the heirs of William Ogley, deceased, late of Shelby County, Ala., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of retail druggists of Eau Claire, Wis., urging the reduction of the tax on alcohol used in medicinal preparations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOERDERER: Petition of Nature's Remedy Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring House bill 178—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Redstone Presbytery, of Kenneth, Pa., favoring the establishment of a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Mill Men's Union, No. 359, Carpenters and Joiners, of Philadelphia, Pa., for the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Resolutions of the Odessa Mutual Relief Society, the Independent Kletzker Brotherly Aid Association, Joseph Meisels Lodge, No. 146, and Schewas Achim Brainsker Lodge, No. 322, Order of B'rith Abraham, relating to methods of the immigration bureau at the port of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the New York State legislative board of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, urging the passage of the eight-hour bill, anti-injunction and conspiracy bill, and the safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolutions of the National Board of Trade, favoring encouragement of American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Allegheny County, Pa., for the passage of the immigration bill, also favoring the McCumber bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL: Protests of citizens of Bedminster and East Millstone, N. J., against repeal of the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of A. W. Brandt and others, of Des Moines, Iowa, for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of a building in China for the display of American manufactures—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the same, favoring the construction by the War Department of a cable from the State of Washington to the district of Alaska—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the same, favoring the purchase of the Nacimiento Rancho, California, for a military instruction camp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: Papers to accompany House bill 16534, granting an increase of pension to J. H. Durham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., in relation to amending the currency laws and the deposits of public moneys—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ellaville, Ga., opposing the repeal of the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of the heirs of Harriet F. Isaacs, deceased, late of Drew County, Ark., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Petition of Prophet Jecheskel Lodge, No. 76, Order of B'rith Abraham, Chicago, Ill., relative to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of legislative committee of Branch No. 148, National Association of Post-Office Clerks, South Omaha, Nebr., asking for the passage of Senate bill 4949—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Resolutions of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of Indiana, in favor of House bill 15990, known as the employers' liability bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of West Philadelphia (Pa.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of Trades and Labor Assembly of Galesburg, Ill., for the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: Papers to accompany bill relating to the correction of the military record of Anthony Connolly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Peter Welsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of citizens of Fairfax County, Va., for the improvement of the channel of Accotink Creek, in Fairfax County—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of W. J. Tyree and 16 others, of Columbia City, Ind., for reduction of tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petitions of C. A. Charles, F. A. Spencer, and other retail druggists, urging the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petitions of Caryville (Pa.) Grange, No. 1212, and Farmers Valley Grange, No. 1190, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, against the repeal of the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of the same for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Abraham J. Yeomans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOMPKINS of New York: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Anna P. Erving—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Nyack, N. Y., asking for the removal of the tariff on certain glass products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Arthur J. Drury and others, urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODS: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce, of San Francisco, Cal., urging the purchase of the Nacimiento Rancho, California, for a military instruction camp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the same favoring the construction of a building in China for the display of American manufactures—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the same, asking for the construction by the War Department of a cable from the State of Washington to the district of Alaska—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Pennsylvania Shoe Manufacturers Association, urging the establishment of a department of commerce and industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 22, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington. The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the Journal.

Mr. KEAN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey objects.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the Journal.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. KEAN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey objects.

Mr. CULLOM. I did not know that there had been any objection before or I would not have made the request.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Journal will stand approved. The Journal is approved.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the third annual report of the American National Red Cross for the year ended December 31, 1902; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of Maine Lodge, No. 545, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of East St. Louis; of Local Union No. 730, United Mine Workers, of Gillespie, and of Local Division No. 241, Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees, of Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the internal-revenue law so as to reduce the tax on distilled spirits; which were ordered to lie on the table.